

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

OUR debt to Greece is incalculable. Apart from the spheres of law and religion, most of the thinking and many of the activities of modern men are inspired by thoughts that had their origin in her. It was she who gave the ultimate impulse to our philosophic, and in one sense even to our scientific, thought. Physics, mathematics, politics, history, linguistics, literature with its multifarious kinds of prose and poetry—ancient Greece has largely conditioned the forms which these intellectual activities have assumed in the modern world, and has largely determined the vocabulary in which these activities are expressed.

Any good book on Greece will therefore always be welcome to all who are interested in how the modern world came to be. And such a book is that by Principal Maurice HUTTON of University College, Toronto, on *The Greek Point of View* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Principal HUTTON has for many years been Professor of Greek, and every page of his book attests his familiarity with his subject. Yet, though he loves Greece, it is not with that passion which is blind to the defects of the beloved. He has caught the Greek spirit of criticism. Indeed he is very critical of Greece, and over and over again he puts his finger upon what he regards as her supreme defect, viz. her exaggerated emphasis on the things of the intellect; and a chapter which he adds on Rome almost per-

suades us that at the bottom of his heart he has a warmer regard for Rome than for Greece.

One criticism we would make to begin with. The discussion hardly satisfies all the hopes raised by the title. It is very largely confined to an appreciation and criticism of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. Now it is true that in these great men the spirit of Greece can be more than obscurely discerned. They came at the end of a period of extraordinary vitality, in which the nation had created immortal history and immortal literature, and these philosophers were more than usually well qualified to gather up its meaning. But, great as they are, they do not exhaust Greece. Homer and Hesiod, the lyric poets, the dramatic poets, the historians, the Anthology, all in their own several ways illustrate the Greek point of view; and of these we do not hear much, though we do hear a little, in this volume. But after all we have no right to quarrel with an author for selecting from so vast a field the particular area he desires to traverse; and the area Principal HUTTON has chosen is one which enables him to do justice to his own very real powers of ethical analysis.

May we make one more criticism, suggested by the rather touching preface? In it, quoting a colleague, the Principal says: 'The painful student who has laboured at the art of expression for a

lifetime has nothing to express ; the man who has a life and a story to tell has never acquired the art of expression.' We should have thought that a writer like Conrad, with his full and stern experience of life on the inhospitable sea and master surely of the art of style, is a sufficient refutation of this dictum. But is it not refuted by Greek literature itself? Mr. Livingstone, in his charming book on 'The Greek Genius,' has pointed out that part of the greatness of Greek literature lies in this that it springs so immediately out of life : Thucydides the historian, for example, was an admiral. That literature was not the product of the study, it was the outflow of life, written by men who for the most part were immersed in the actualities of life ; and their power of expression no one who knows that literature will question.

The subjects dealt with in successive chapters are these—The Greek City-State, Virtue is Knowledge, Virtue and Art, Hellenism in Character, Hellenism in Language, Naturalism, Socrates and Plato as Theists, Greek Religion, Stoicism, and Rome. Subtle and illuminating things abound in every chapter ; illuminating—for the Principal has the philosopher's interest in the meaning of life, and the preacher's interest in the secret of the good life, and he makes his knowledge of Greek literature contributory to the satisfaction of those interests. 'Life,' he remarks, leaning on the *Phædo* and the *Apology*, 'is essentially for the good man a venture of faith, a speculation of hope, a gamble of love.'

There are gentle ironies, too, interspersed throughout the discussion. Alluding to a remark in the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, he slyly adds, 'this Divine life is thinking upon Thought, *whatever that may be*' (italics ours). And of eloquence this is what he says: 'No man who knows is ever eloquent and no man who is eloquent ever knows his subject ; a man is eloquent out of half-knowledge, out of the little knowledge that is dangerous ; the great orator is eloquent because he has a mystic vision and one idea ; if he saw further and knew more

his eloquence would fail him ; and he would become as ineffective on a platform as an historian or a philosopher are ineffective.' Incidentally this sentence illustrates a curious habit of Principal HUTTON'S—curious in an accomplished Greek scholar—of building long compound sentences out of simpler sentences separated by semicolons. There are many such sentences a page in length.

The Principal knows very well, of course, that the sentence last quoted is a paradox, but it is a paradox with its measure of truth ; and he is led into writing it in the course of, and indeed as part of, his criticism of the Socratic paradox, equally if not more inadequate as an expression of ultimate truth, that virtue is knowledge and an art. This is the point at which he challenges most drastically the Greek contribution to the science of the good life. Repeatedly he insists, as he well puts it on p. 56, that 'virtue depends not upon knowledge, but upon the disciplining of the will to follow such instincts as are dimly felt to be best, until, in the fullness of time they come to prove themselves best, and he that has willed has learned of the doctrine (to adopt the familiar words of the New Testament), and the scales of lower passions have at last fallen from the eyes.'

The defect of the Greek was that, in exalting the understanding, he ignored the will. Socrates ignored it, because with him the will unhesitatingly obeyed the understanding ; the average Greek ignored it, because he was constitutionally deficient in will-power. Strictly speaking, the Greek is not interested in virtue, as we understand it : the word which is commonly rendered 'virtue' means with him 'excellence'—excellence as much in non-ethical as in ethical spheres. Athens is a University rather than a State, and the typical Greek is the clever man, a man, for example, like Themistocles, to whose career the Principal devotes three interesting pages—a man very adroit and entirely unhampered by scruple.

Cognate to this defect was the Greek distrust of

those instincts and impulses which lie embedded deep among the ultimate things in our human equipment, and it was the very lucidity of the Greek intellect that created or, at least encouraged, this distrust. The Greeks were intolerant of vagueness, everything had to be sharply defined, with the result that, as many things, including some of the deepest, in our experience are incapable of exact definition, Greek explanations are not seldom superficial, inadequate, and unsatisfactory.

But in the two chapters on 'Socrates and Plato as Theists' and 'Greek Religion' Principal HURTON supplements and qualifies his indictment against the Greek view of life by reminding us that, in spite of its prevailing intellectualism, there flashes out at times a 'certain passionate Theism.' Socrates and Plato were religious men, their spirit is occasionally, though no more than occasionally, even Christian; and in them there are anticipations, both in phrase and in spirit, of the New Testament. We do not quite agree, however, with the Principal when he suggests that '*only* in the philosophers, in Socrates and Plato, does religion seem to be part of their serious view of life'—what of the tragedians?—any more than we agree with him when he says that 'the Greeks shone *only* in prosperity.'

The book makes us feel afresh how much the modern world may still learn from Greece, in spite of and because of her shortcomings. We learn from the turmoil of her history that a patriotism which is nothing more than an enlightened self-interest will not carry us very far, and that the individualism, which showed itself politically as state self-determination, leads in our own days, when pushed as it has been to mad extremes, to 'a wild and chaotic nationalism of petty states.' All this, and much more, will be found in this suggestive book—interesting comparisons, for example, between the logical and nimble-witted French and Greeks, and between the honest, if somewhat stodgy, Romans and British.

There is much, too, in the book to arrest the

preacher—among other things, a fine parallel between Socrates who cared for the intellect, and Jesus for the character, of his disciples. 'Socrates, like the Master, spoke in parables; in parables homely to grotesqueness but in parables; Socrates, like the Master, spoke of a second birth of a kind, an intellectual re-birth or "conversion" necessary for his disciples and over which he presided; Socrates, like the Master, was at home in humble houses and spent much of his time, like St. Peter, "in the house of one Simon a tanner" (or a shoemaker),' etc.

Excellent, too, is this, from the passage in which the Principal is contrasting the Pauline with the Greek conception of humility: 'St. Paul tells us at first whilst he is still a novice in the faith of Christ, that he is the least of all the Apostles and not worthy of being called an Apostle; at a later date when his knowledge of Christ has progressed, that he is the least of all "saints" or Church members; and last of all, when he is finishing his good fight and keeping the faith, that he is the chief of sinners; as he grew in grace his sense of his imperfections found ever stronger expression; clearly it was his moral aspiration and his purified will that prompted this rising scale of self-abasement, and not a nice perception of his own claims as measured by the claims of his neighbours.'

We are all of us grateful to Dr. L. P. JACKS for the service he has done to religious thought by his writings. But there is sometimes a strain of perverseness in what he writes. And this is apparent in an article he contributes to the current number of the *Hibbert Journal* on 'A Creed in Harmony with Modern Thought.' He quotes the phrase as one that has been much in evidence of late as indicating one of the aims of liberal theology, and especially of the Modernist party in the Church of England. Is the achievement hinted at in the phrase possible? That is the question Dr. JACKS discusses.

He begins with a kind of amiable snarl at creeds in general. Harmonizing is a two-sided process, he says. And modern thought may not be willing to be harmonized with 'the creeds,' the characteristic of modern thought being, precisely, its aversion to all creeds whatsoever. But does the phrase quoted above really refer to 'creeds' in this sense at all? When any one uses it what he means surely is simply a religious belief. If he aims at 'a creed in harmony with modern thought,' what he wants is a religious belief that is in harmony with all we have really discovered about the world and God. The Modernist in the Church of England, for example, is the very last person who wishes to construct a creed of the kind to which Dr. JACKS refers.

But it is equally necessary to look at the other term of the phrase, namely, 'modern thought.' What does this mean? Dr. JACKS apparently thinks it means the opinions of everybody who can be considered a modern thinker. 'A creed in harmony with modern thought would be a creed that satisfied not only Sir Joseph Thompson, Dr. J. S. Haldane, and Mr. Julian Huxley, but also Sir James Frazer, Professor Gilbert Murray, Mr. Bertrand Russell, Dr. Graham Wallas, Dr. William McDougall, Dr. Samuel Alexander, and last, but not least, M. Alfred Loisy.' This sentence is very daunting to the inquirer who wishes to find a faith that is reasonable. It suggests a picture of a bewildered person going the round of these eminent men, and many others (for the list 'might be extended indefinitely'), to discover if they are all satisfied with his faith before he can commit himself to it. He would have a job in hand!

One difficulty would prove insoluble. He would go to M. Loisy and then to Professor Harnack, and he would find them quite irreconcilable on the most important points, and he would thus be 'as far as ever from a creed in harmony with modern thought.' No doubt. And he would be in the same geographical position if he tried to satisfy all the distinguished persons whose names have been given

above. But do we really need to wait until they can all be satisfied before we believe anything about God and His truth? There would never have been any belief at all in the world if men had waited, hat in hand, till every distinguished person had no more objections to offer.

There have always been thinkers in the world who have differed widely from orthodoxy and even from truth as it came to be ascertained later. But no sensible person has ever imagined that faith is impossible till all kinds of thinkers have come to an agreement. The plain thinking man tries to find out what God has revealed about Himself in any and every sphere to which he has access. And he lives this out from day to day. His 'creed' consists in the truth he has verified for himself with what is to him sufficient certainty. And so 'a creed in harmony with modern thought' is *not* a creed that satisfies a long list of eminent men, but one that is in harmony with the ascertained results of honest investigation, that is uncontradicted by any sure facts within the plain man's knowledge.

Dr. JACKS thinks, however, that there is one person whose conclusions may, if they are verified, overthrow everything that can be called Christian belief, and his article has been written really to introduce us to M. Alfred Loisy's contentions about primitive Christianity. Briefly, his position is that Jesus Christ is 'a mere point or nucleus round which the illuminism of the first century consolidated itself into the faith of the Church.' Between this and the contention of Drews that Jesus never existed there is little perceptible difference. M. Loisy also contends that what we have in Luke's Gospel and Acts is not the original Gospel or Acts at all, but a superstructure erected by the Church to take the place of the original, and erected by one who was a forger (*un faussaire*) and whose work is a species of jugglery (*escamotage*).

These conclusions, as Dr. JACKS points out, are in conflict with Harnack's results. And Dr. JACKS' comment is: 'All the same it cannot be denied

that the fortunes of Christianity are in a very precarious condition so long as they are made to depend on the victory of one school of critics over another.' This is true. But one may ask, Who, with any common sense, would make the fortunes of Christianity depend on the results of a dispute between two antagonists, even so distinguished? There have been such antagonisms all through the ages. There are many to-day. But the fortunes of Christianity do not depend on, do not wait for, the victory in any such contest. The truth will certainly appear sometime. Meantime the Christian faith rests on stronger foundations than 'modern thought.' It rests on history, and on experience, and on the person of Christ Himself, and that is a threefold cord not easily broken.

Recent events in America have made it evident that the Fundamentalist controversy is likely to disturb the peace of the Church for years to come. To many Christian minds—they may be unenlightened—Science and Genesis are still unreconciled and the principles of the Higher Criticism are anathema. It is too hastily assumed in some quarters that these questions were settled in Britain for good a generation ago, and that the religious storm across the Atlantic need not trouble us. This is undoubtedly a mistake. Apart from anything else, it is a serious matter that a very large section of religious opinion in America regards the Protestant Churches of Britain as having betrayed the faith. That belief constitutes a formidable bar to brotherly relations, as was evidenced at the recent Pan-Presbyterian Council.

Moreover, is it so certain that Christian opinion on this side of the Atlantic is as unanimous as appears to be assumed? On the contrary, the truth is that the rank and file of the Churches are still largely in the position of having their minds uninformed and their opinions undecided. Preachers generally, even those who have accepted the principles of the Higher Criticism, have not felt it their duty to deal in the pulpit with questions of

literary and historical criticism. The suggestion that this is due to moral cowardice is grotesque. The simple reason is that preachers, finding that the Bible, after passing through the fires of criticism, remains the Word of God no less than before, are more concerned to break the bread of life to their people than to trouble them with matters that seem remote from the problems of daily life. This may or may not be wise, but it means that the average Church member knows little about Higher Criticism and cares less.

It must be added that there is latent in many Christian minds a vague suspicion and dislike of the spirit and methods of modern criticism, a dislike which has some justification in the attitude and utterances of many critics. Too often the assumption seems to be made that reason and science are all on the one side, and only ignorance and prejudice on the other. This may be clever and effective as a weapon of controversy, but it is never a wise and becoming assumption, and in discussions among Christian brethren it is deplorable. It provokes antipathy where conciliation is most needed, and leads to the formation of hostile camps. This has already happened in America, where the Fundamentalists have declared that 'it is going to mean war to the knife, knife to the hilt,' and it is a danger from which the Protestant Churches of Britain are by no means free, for if a popular appeal were made with passionate conviction no one could predict how large a proportion of the rank and file might be swayed towards the Fundamentalist position.

These reflections have been suggested by the reading of *A Scientist's Belief in the Bible* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net). The author is Professor Howard A. KELLY, M.D., LL.D., a surgeon of great distinction and the writer of standard medical works. As the production of a man of science the book is amazing, so completely does it ignore, while professing strictly to follow, scientific method. It is useful as a reminder that distinction in one branch of science does not make a man an authority on other

subjects. A distinguished physicist is not necessarily an authority on spiritualism, nor a popular novelist on religion. In this case Dr. KELLY is clearly off his beat. He does not even know what Higher Criticism is. To him it is simply 'a destructive analysis of the Holy Scriptures,' the effect of which is to 'tear the Bible to pieces,' discredit miracles, and deny the Deity of our Lord, His atoning death and resurrection. This, of course, is to confuse methods of historical study with results, and summarily to excommunicate all Higher Critics.

Dr. KELLY confesses himself to be a thorough-going pragmatist. Finding, as he believes, that the Bible, 'manifestly everywhere claimed in all its parts to be the very literal Word of God to men,' he so accepted and applied it. 'Tested in this way, the Bible worked, and from that day on I became as a Christian philosopher, a member of the great school of pragmatists, for pragmatism defines practicability as the supreme test of any doctrine: it only asks, Does it work well?' The substance of his book is devoted to showing that the Bible works, or, in other words, is adequate to the spiritual needs of men.

But all this is beside the point. It has never been denied by believing critics. On the contrary, they have confessed it *ex animo*, and no one with more passionate conviction and impressiveness than Robertson Smith, the great protagonist of modern

criticism. 'Of this I am sure at the outset,' he wrote, 'that the Bible does speak to the heart of man in words that can only come from God—that no historical research can deprive me of this conviction, or make less precious the divine utterances that speak straight to the heart.' In these circumstances it must be accounted deplorable that Christian men, who equally find in the Bible the living Word of God to their souls, should fall asunder in mutual suspicion and enmity, with charges of heresy on the one hand, and of bigotry on the other. May there not be something to confess on both sides?

The Fundamentalist has been accused of 'compromising Christianity before the intelligence of the world,' of 'scattering thorns in the path of the young Greeks of our day who would see Jesus.' Must it not also be said that some Higher Critics, in clearing the path of the young Greeks, have appeared to throw formidable obstacles in the way of simple believers, have worked too much in the cold light of science, have in effect taken that very sacred and living thing, the gospel, and exhibited it, all duly dissected and labelled, but dead? There is need of much forbearance and conciliation, above all of clear instruction, given with all patience and sympathy and warm Christian feeling, so that, while doubts are cleared away, the timid may be reassured and the wayfaring man may be taught to turn with fresh interest to his Bible, and find it more human, more vital, more precious than before.

A Factor of Old Testament Influence in the New Testament.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., MANCHESTER.

THE general problem of the influence of the Old Testament on the New has been the subject of a multitude of investigations, undertaken from different points of view, and dating from the earliest days of the Christian Church. Such

studies were both natural and necessary, if the dictum of the Church that the Holy Ghost spake by the Prophets was to acquire creedal value. Our concern here, however, is with but one aspect of the subject, namely, some quotations from the

Old which are embodied in the New. In modern Greek Testaments, the presence of such quotations in the text is usually indicated by a change of type, leading the reader at once to the Hebrew original, or, more commonly, to the related text of the Septuagint. If, on the other hand, we were in possession of a copy of Marcion's New Testament, we should not find any variety of type, or marginal references suggestive of other sources. Quotations from the Old Testament, or any reference to it as an authority, would have been fatal to Marcion's theological theory, so he simplified matters by omitting such dogmatic references from his version of the gospel. Some, indeed, slipped in, in spite of him (he would have been very lynx-eyed to detect them all), and these became arrows, for use against him, by Tertullian and other controversialists. Perhaps, then, the actual practice of making marginal references had, in the first instance, a controversial intention. However that may be, it would be easy to show that there is, of necessity, much theology involved in these O.T. texts and their associated marginal references. Often, too, they serve to correct the text of the N.T. itself from transcriptional or other errors.

There is one direction in which it seems probable that results of definite theological value may be obtained from the quotations and the marginalia. We may raise the question of particular books, and the evidence for particular themes. The subject of Isaiah's influence on N.T. writers comes under the one head; that of the Suffering Servant under the other. If we treat them together, we must do so under the title 'What Christ and His disciples thought of Isaiah, and what, in particular, was the use that they made of the 53rd chapter.' The study might yield some valuable results. One reason for making such a statement lies in the fact that the student will soon be able to verify (what might indeed have been assumed) that the treatment of the O.T. in the N.T. is unequal. There are large sections of its text from which nothing has been borrowed, and there are others which have been the subject of special attention, the reason of which we are sometimes able to divine.

For example, there are two adjacent chapters in Deuteronomy, containing respectively what are called the *Song of Moses* and the *Blessing of Moses*. Of these two chapters the former is credited by Dr. Hort with four times as many quotations in the N.T. as the latter. Admit that the former is a

good deal longer than the other, there is still a disproportion in the number of quotations which sets us on the search for its cause. Why should the one be more used than the other as a source of authoritative appeal? When we examine the *Song* by the side of the *Blessing*, the difference between them stands out clearly. The *Song* is almost the opposite of blessing: it is 'near to cursing'; for it contains a catalogue of the aberrations of the chosen people, and adjusts Divine judgments to them; misfortunes are read in the light of misdeeds; infidelities and their consequences are described in detail. In this fact we find the answer to our question. The plenitude of quotations from the *Song* is due to the material it furnishes for an arraignment of the Jewish people; it is a natural treasury for *Testimonia adversus Judæos*.

We can verify this hypothesis in a number of ways. Suppose we turn to Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, and examine whether he makes any use of the *Song* or of the *Blessing*: the *index locorum* will show us at once that he quotes the *Song* on nine occasions, involving the following verses, 4. 7-9. 15. 16-23. 30 (four times), and 43; on the other hand, the *Blessing* is only twice referred to, and the quotation covers some three verses. This shows that the same preference for quotation from the *Song* prevails in the *Dialogue* as in the New Testament generally. In the case of the former, of course, we are definitely concerned with anti-Judaic propaganda and the exigencies of anti-Judaic controversy. It seems natural, therefore, to infer that, when the *Song* is quoted in the N.T., the probability is in favour of the belief that the quotation is used anti-Judaically. The importance of this consideration will appear if we take an actual case of such quotations. In Ph 2¹⁵ the Apostle desires that his disciples may be the 'blameless children of God, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation.' Here modern editors point out by indications in the type used, that there is a reference to Dt 32⁵ in the text of the LXX, where Moses speaks of the Israelites as being 'no children of God, blameworthy, a crooked and perverse generation':

οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα, μωμητά·
γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη.

Now let us see how Lightfoot will comment upon the observed parallel: he says, 'A direct contrast

to the Israelites in the desert, who in the song of Moses are described, etc.' No doubt that is correct as far as it goes, but it will be much more vivid and to the point at the moment when St. Paul is writing, if for 'Israelites in the desert' we understand 'the Jews among whom you live'; and, indeed, St. Paul has made that interpretation almost inevitable by adding in his text the words 'in the midst of' before the 'crooked and perverse.' He is thinking of the Jewish opposers of his preaching and teaching when he was at Philippi and after he left them. It was they, of the living present, who were for St. Paul the crooked and perverse people, though he saw them also as the inheritors of an unbroken tradition of collective infidelity. The children were doing what the fathers had done.

This instance of anti-Judaism in the text of Philippians is but one out of a complex of O.T. testimonies against the chosen people. We will take another illustration to show how the recognition of this complex will help us even in the editing of the text of the N.T. In 1 Co 10 St. Paul is resolving cases of conscience for the new community, and, in particular, the question of the use that may lawfully be made of meat that has been associated with idolatrous worship. Here, at least, we might expect freedom from hostility to Judaism or of any anti-Judaic reminiscences. We should expect, *a priori*, that both the Gentile and the Judaizer would be in agreement on the question at issue, would feel the same difficulty and accept the same solution. Or, if it should be objected that persons of Jewish extraction or Jewish sympathy would naturally eat Kosher meat, and therefore must be reckoned as outside the discussion, that would be an additional reason for regarding the chapter to which we are referring, as containing and resolving Gentile perplexities in a Gentile environment. But let us see what really goes on in the mind of the Apostle. Instead of ignoring the Jews, he drags them into the discussion. He tells his inquirers to 'observe the carnal Israel!' That is a hostile opening. Then he proceeds to quote the *Song of Moses* in the words: 'What they sacrifice is worship of devils, not of God.' This is Dt 32¹⁷, with only a change of tense; and it is clear that the subject of the word 'sacrifice' is the carnal Israel. This startling conclusion is evaded by most of the N.T. MSS, which insert the words 'the Gentiles' before the

verb, so as to read ἀ θύει [τὰ ἔθνη], δαίμονιους θύει καὶ οὐ Θεῷ instead of ἀ θύουσιν, δαίμονιους θύουσιν.

Now let us turn to Cyprian's *Testimonies* (i. 1), where we find him opening his classical anti-Judaic campaign in these words: *Item in Deuteronomio: Sacrificaverunt [sc. Judæi]—daimoniis et non Deo*. It is clear, then, that in 1 Co 10 St. Paul is quoting an anti-Judaic testimony, already current in his own time. The scribes of the Epistle, at a later date, could not believe that he was using the words in their original application, and they amended the text; in which course they have been followed by the English Revisers, and, with some hesitation expressed in a bracket, by Dr. Hort.

To show further how the mind of the Apostle was dominated by the text of Deuteronomy, we may notice that he sums up his argument against sacrifices and participation in them, in the words, 'Are we going to provoke the Lord to jealousy?' This again is a parallel with the *Song of Moses*, in which it is said that they (*i.e.* the Jews) provoked the Lord to jealousy with non-God, and irritated him with their idols. The Apostle is asking the new believers whether they are going to fall into the same condemnation through idolatry as the Jews were in and continue under. Evidently the condemnatory words were familiar to his mind; the theme that the Jews had provoked God was already a commonplace. If we are in any doubt as to the anti-Judaism of these quotations, we have only to observe that in the great repository of anti-Judaic matter in the Epistle to the Romans we have the further sequence (Ro 10¹⁹) where Moses says: 'I will provoke you to jealousy with a nation: with a foolish nation I will enrage you.'

Now let us see how this passage is used by the early Christian Apologists. Aphrahat the Persian, in his eleventh homily entitled *On Circumcision*, says that Moses, in that *Hymn of Testimony*, points out the people of the Gentiles, and says, 'I will provoke you to jealousy by a people that is not a people.' Here we notice not only the use of the quotation in an anti-Judaic sense, but the description of the whole as a *Song of Testimony*. There can be no doubt about this; for in the previous sentences Aphrahat says, 'Moses, their leader, testified against them. . . . In the *Hymn of Testimony* he said again, 'Your vine is from the vine of Sodom, etc.' (Dt 32³²). Clearly Aphrahat regards the *Song of Moses* as a storehouse of anti-Judaic

arguments. The quotation is repeated in his 16th homily, which is a demonstration that 'the peoples' have been substituted for 'the People': here again he says, 'In the *Song of Testimony* (Moses) says to the people: I will provoke you to jealousy, etc.' (*Dem.* 16, 1.).

The student of testimonies will find frequent use made of these Deuteronomic passages in Justin, in Greg. Nyss., in Bar Salibi, etc. As the last-named writer's work is not yet published, we give one quotation from his *Testimonies against the Jews*: 'Listen to Moses how he said: Israel hath grown fat and got prominent eyes: he waxed fat and grew strong and he obtained riches and he forgot God who made him. I also will make him jealous with not-my-people, and with a foolish people I will provoke him to anger.' Perhaps enough has now been said to show the strength of the influence of the *Ode* or *Song of Moses* on the N.T.

How far back is this anti-Judaic use of O.T. passages traceable? The question is an important one. Two opposed opinions prevail at present; one inclined to regard the definite massing and ordering of such polemical matter, as little, if at all, earlier than the days of Cyprian; the other which affirms that these texts formed part of the earliest Christian propaganda, that this use of them is reflected in the N.T. literature, and may, with reason, be credited to the Apostles themselves; perhaps, even to their Master.

In the particular case we have been considering, that of the *Song of Moses*, the evidence certainly points to its early polemical use, but was it used earlier than by St. Paul? Is there any trace of it in the Gospels in the language of Jesus?

Here is an interesting case which has recently attracted the attention of the textual critics. In Lk 9⁴¹ the Lord addresses the crowd which had gathered round Him on His descent from the Mount of Transfiguration as a 'faithless and perverse generation.' This is not very remote from the 'crooked and perverse (δυστραμμένη) generation' of Dt 32⁵. At this point two of the oldest Western MSS omit the words 'and perverse.' Professor Burkitt, reviewing Streeter's new book in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April 1925, suggests that the Western omission is right, and that the added words have been introduced by parallelization from Dt 32⁵. 'The geographically Western text is right,' according to Burkitt. He

has, however, overlooked the fact that there is a closer reference in the *Song* than the one which he quotes. In v.²⁰ the Jews are described as 'a perverse generation, children in whom is no faith': γενεὰ δυστραμμένη ἐστὶν υἱοὶ οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς.

This is much nearer to the language of Jesus than the 'crooked and perverse generation,' and therefore if the text of the Gospel has been discoloured from the *Song*, this is the passage to refer to. But in that case it does not look like a scribe's variation taken from the LXX, but a free quotation. In other words, it is the original text of the Gospel, and is a formula of Jesus Himself. So we have one more suggestion of His polemical use of the O.T.

The discovery that Aphrahat the Persian employs extracts from Dt 32 in an anti-Judaic manner, saying that they are taken from a *Song of Testimony* would, of itself, be almost sufficient to prove that he had access, not only to the text of Deuteronomy, but also to some tabulated extracts from the same source. We can, however, carry our investigation a step further, for the very expression, 'Song of Testimony,' is taken from the previous chapter of Deuteronomy. Here we find Moses himself saying, 'Write this song . . . that this song may be a witness for me against the children of Israel' (Dt 31¹⁹); and again, 'This song shall testify against them for a witness' (Dt 31²¹).

The origin, then, of the expression *Testimonia adversus Judæos* is not to be looked for in Cyprian, or in any other of the sub-Apostolical fathers; it comes from the Scripture itself. It is a Mosaic creation. The formation of a collection of Testimonies began with the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy, and may very well have opened with 'Moses says.' The anti-Judaists had Scripture on their side and the Jewish legislator himself for their inspiration.

We may test the accuracy of this conclusion by examining the way in which Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho* introduces his quotations from the *Song of Moses* (for, as we have shown above, Justin has the same tendency as the N.T. itself, to quote from the *Song* rather than the *Blessing*). For instance, in c. 20 we find him criticising the Israelite people as follows: 'You were prone and very ready to depart from his knowledge, as *Moses also declares*, that "the people ate and drank and rose up to play"' (Ex 32⁶); and again: 'Jacob

ate and was satisfied, and waxed fat, and he who was beloved kicked: he waxed fat, he grew thick, he was enlarged; and he forsook God who had made him' (Dt 32¹³). The passage is interesting as showing that, when St. Paul quotes Ex 32⁶ in 1 Co 10⁸, he is working in a Testimony. Similarly, in c. 130, Justin introduces his Testimony by saying, 'I wish to add some other passages *from the very words of Moses*,' and in the opening of c. 30 he says, 'I will now adduce some passages which I had not recounted before. They are recorded by *that faithful servant Moses* in parable and are as follows: "Rejoice, O ye heavens, with Him, and let all the angels of God worship Him, etc." This quotation is specially important because it shows not only that Moses is made responsible for the *Song of Testimony*, and is introduced as the speaker into the *Dialogue*, but as showing once more that the verse in the opening chapter of Hebrews ('Let all the angels of God worship him'), as well as St. Paul's quotation in Ro 15¹⁰ ('Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people'), are taken from the *Testimonies* involved and contained in the *Song of Moses*.

In the same manner in *Dial.*, c. 119, Justin quotes eight verses from the *Song*, beginning thus: 'That the *saying of Moses* might be fulfilled, they provoked me with strange gods, etc.,' where the N.T. parallels should again be noted. It is clear, then, that Moses and his *Song* are the point of departure for the earliest collection of *Testimonies*.

If our reasonings are correct, and we have found the right view-point from which to study the collection of *Testimonies*, we can easily picture the evolution of the early anti-Judaic Literature. Our starting-point is the *Song of Moses* in the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy, but we have shown that there is, in the 31st chapter of the same book, a wider outlook than that revealed in the *Song*. For Moses completes his instructions as to the use of the *Song*, with a command: viz. that this book of the law, to wit, Deuteronomy on the large scale, is to be laid up in or beside the ark, *that it may be there for a witness against thee*. Thus the reader is invited to use the whole book anti-Judaically, and not merely the *Song*. That the Christians did so may be seen from the following extract taken from the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (p. 89): 'For this very reason Moses, wailing and lamenting over you, *testified of these things in Deuteronomy, and more especially in the Song*. Yea! in the *Song*,

too, he spoke of the Gentiles and visaged their return to God.' We may take this to be a fair representation of the evolution of the controversy between Jews and Christians. Its first source is the *Song of Moses*: its chief characteristic is to stress the infidelity of the Jews and their ingratitude. It is significant that this is also the accusation of Cyprian, in his first book of *Testimonies*, which begins with the statement that the Jews have been guilty of grave offence against God, in forsaking the Lord and following idols; a fair summary of the assertions in the *Song*, where we are told that 'Jacob deserted God who made him,' 'provoked God with strange gods,' 'deserted God who begat him,' 'provoked God with their idols.' Moreover Cyprian, as we have seen, almost immediately quotes a proof-text, '*Item in Deuteronomio, Sacrificaverunt dæmoniis et non Deo.*'

Justin Martyr, too, gives extended proof of Jewish infidelity, starting from the words of the *Song*, and proving also that the believing Gentiles are the true Israel and people of God, concludes with the injunction, 'Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people,' as St. Paul does in the Epistle to the Romans (Ro 15¹⁰). The *Song*, then, was the basis of controversy and of polemical denunciation at an earlier date than that of the Pauline Epistles.

In conclusion, let us notice how the new point of view with regard to the influence of the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy upon early Christian theology will clarify the interpretation of a passage in the Apocalypse. We have seen (and the evidence might easily be added to) that the early Apologists and Controversialists deduced, from the words of Moses, the doctrine that the Gentiles had come into the Divine Inheritance, and were the true Israel of God. Now in the 15th chapter of the Apocalypse we have one of the *Songs of Victory* which is sung in the regions celestial. It is called by the writer the *Song of Moses and the Lamb*; and it has been the custom of commentators to explain that this song has its parallel in the exultation of the Israelites on the shores of the Red Sea. In view of our study, the parallel appears to be erroneous. The *Song of Moses*, as we have seen, is the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy. The writer, indeed, reveals his sources. He says, 'Great and true are all thy works, Lord God Almighty. Just and true are all thy ways, O King of the Gentiles: . . . The Gentiles shall come and worship before thee. . . .' The expressions italicized are clearly under

the influence of Dt 32⁴, 'God, his works are true, and all his ways judgment.' Moreover, we have seen that the first generation of Christians argued from this very chapter the entrance of the Gentiles into the inheritance of the Chosen People. This

fact has been lost sight of by interpreters of the Apocalypse. For ourselves, we trust we have succeeded in showing, in some measure at least, the important place which the *Song of Moses* occupies in the early Christian literature.

Literature.

DR. GLOVER ON PAUL.

DR. GLOVER, having tried, with a success now known to all, to picture for this generation the historical Jesus, has essayed the task, in some respects far more formidable, of picturing for us the greatest disciple of Jesus—*Paul of Tarsus* (S.C.M.; 9s. net). For this work he has several important qualifications. His classical studies stand him in good stead, not only in such larger matters as his instructive account of the Tarsus of Paul's day (in which city Paul must have early learned that interest in the Gentiles which played so prominent a part in his later life) and of the Stoic philosophy, to which some think Paul's debt was considerable, but also in the translations that reveal the accurate scholar; for example, 'we shall not all sleep, *i.e.* we shall none of us sleep.' (Is he equally accurate in accepting the reading from which he gives the paraphrase: 'Death has lost its sting, *the grave* will lose its victory'?)

Further, he has considerable first-hand acquaintance with life in non-Christian lands, especially in India, which sheds so much light on New Testament problems. He has sympathized with the Muhammadan's contempt for popular Hinduism, with the puerilities and immoralities of its idolatrous temples. The impossibility of believing that an Indian Muhammadan, turned Christian, will go to the mystical school of the Hindu Chaitanya for language in which to express his deepest feelings, increases the difficulty of believing that Paul found much of his inspiration in the heathen mysticism of his day.

Dr. Glover makes us feel, too, that the great interpreters of Paul are not necessarily those who may have some acquaintance with the environment in which Paul lived (Paul may never have come into vital contact with certain aspects of his supposed environment), but those who have had a

spiritual experience like his own. Augustine and Luther and Wesley are better guides to Paul's thought than an expert on the comparative study of religion.

The book reveals the author's healthy belief that a recondite explanation has no necessary advantage over a simple one. If Paul once thought of his pre-Christian self as a bullock hurting itself by kicking against the driver's goad, he got his picture, not from Pindar, but from the draught-oxen he saw every day doing this very thing. If he called Jesus 'Lord,' it is more likely that the term was suggested to him by its frequent use in the Old Testament than by the Mystery cults. (Is not the truth rather that the Greek word 'kyrios' was used in practically every sense of the English word 'lord,' and that the very width of its range was part of the attraction for the early Christians who applied it to Jesus?) Nor did Paul require to go beyond the frequent experience of his own eyes for his metaphor of himself as a slave, a branded slave, of Jesus.

Dr. Glover whole-heartedly arrays himself with the increasing number of scholars who decline to believe that Paul was the founder of Christianity, and that he turned the simple religion of Jesus into a Mystery cult with Jesus as its 'Lord' and 'Saviour.' Paul used expressions derived from Stoic philosophy, from Jewish Apocalyptic, and from the Mysteries; expressions which were, doubtless, part of the current speech of the day. But his religion was derived from his own God-guided experience of Jesus of Nazareth. Dr. Glover does not rule out the possibility that Jesus actually 'appeared' to Paul on the way to Damascus, while leaving room for more modern and psychological explanations of the 'vision.' In any case he knew the exalted Jesus and became a new man, and through him multitudes of others have learned to know God in Jesus.

To scholarship, sagacity, spiritual sympathy, and expository power, Dr. Glover adds another indispensable requirement of the interpreter of Paul; he recognizes that he is in the presence of one of the master minds and spirits of all time. The one student of Paul for whom there is no place is the man who approaches him, not with humble reverence and gratitude, but in a spirit of critical superiority. Dr. Glover's testimony to Professor H. A. A. Kennedy is a testimony to his own penetration. 'The scholarship and the sanity of this book,¹ and its author's real acquaintance with Paul's mind, put it in another class than Reitzenstein's loose-hung work.'

Dr. Glover's book is a welcome addition to the recent studies, such as those of Harold Dodd, Peabody, and Deissmann, which have given us new insight into the mind of the great Apostle.

SOME BOOKS ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

It is a curious paradox that in the United States, which has no national system of religious education, greater attention is being paid to the subject than over here. Perhaps it is not a paradox after all. It is probably because observant persons in America see so clearly the need of religious education that they have devoted so much thinking to the subject. In some colleges there is a faculty devoted to this subject alone, with a body of professors more numerous than any theological faculty in this country. It is natural, in these circumstances, that the books we receive dealing with this topic should be largely by American scholars, and that experiments in religious education should be made to such an extent 'over the water.' Four books that have recently been published are all from American authors, though two of them are to be had through the National Sunday School Union in London. These are both by Dr. A. J. W. Myers, who is Professor of Pedagogy at the Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy. They are published in the 'Every Teachers' Library,' which has already given us Professor Mackenzie's book on Psychology and Christian Personality and other good books. The first of Dr. Myers' books is entitled *What is Religious Education?* (The Pilgrim Press; 2s. 6d. net). It is a popular account of the aims and content and methods of religious education. Dr. Myers is apt to announce well-known truths as original dis-

coveries, but this is due to his enthusiasm. His points are well made and most of them are well worth making. He is well up to date in his attitude to the Bible. But he occasionally presses a point too far. While insisting rightly on teaching everything about God from the standpoint of Jesus, he says, 'this criterion will cut out a great many of the generally accepted Bible passages. . . . Too long have trusting little children been given Jewish and pagan ideas of God simply because such notions are taught in parts of the Bible.' If this means that the Old Testament is to be discarded it is a false inference. The doctrine of God in the Old Testament is a growth, and ought to be taught in the light of Jesus' teaching, but the very growth in the Old Testament is valuable and no part of it is without its value for training. We must not let the teacher 'cut out' any of it.

The second book is on *Educational Evangelism* (The Pilgrim Press; 2s. 6d. net). It is a sound piece of work, based on the truth that what is needed to make people Christian is not a revivalist 'conversion' under the influence of emotion, but the development of what is in the person, under the influence of truth and Christian personalities. We ought to educate people up to God or to the recognition and love of God. This is expounded in several interesting chapters, and the gist of it all is that training should take the place of the old revivalist meeting conversion.

Much more elaborate are two other books which have one subject, but deal with it in different ways. The subject is the new conception of teaching and of the curriculum as based on the enriched and controlled experience of the learner rather than on materials systematized into a curriculum. The first of the two books is by the Professor of Religious Education in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky, William Clayton Bower, and is entitled *The Curriculum of Religious Education* (Scribners; \$2.25). The central principle of the book may be said to be that, if the concepts of religion are to be real and vital in the life of the growing religious person, they cannot come to him through formal and external instruction or precepts, but must come through actual experience, real religious ideals and concrete experiments in living. Accordingly the writer condemns the older conceptions of teaching, the Herbartian method, for example, with its ideal of knowledge imparted by the teacher. Everything is to be won by the pupil through being worked out

¹ *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions.*

in experience. Truth is not to be imparted ; it is to be achieved. This sounds well. But Professor Bower's book has two defects. It is unduly severe on older methods and fails to perceive the ways in which they can be, and are being, adapted to newer conceptions. The Herbartian method and ideal, for example, cannot be abandoned, because they have in them essential elements of good teaching, and because in the hands of a good teacher they need not be merely the impartation of knowledge from above, but can be vitally attached to the experience of the pupil. The other defect of this book is that it is vague and indefinite. It would have gained enormously by concrete illustrations of what the writer means by teaching through experience. There is a great deal of intelligent criticism in the book but it lacks point and carries little assured conviction.

What Professor Bower's book lacks is exactly what is supplied in abundance by another book on the same subject—*The Project Principle in Religious Education*, by Mr. Erwin L. Shaver (University of Chicago Press ; \$2.75). This is a book that will deeply impress the reader and will certainly revolutionize the methods and aim of any teacher into whose hands it is put. What Mr. Shaver means by the 'Project Principle' is exactly what Professor Bower means by teaching through controlled experience. A 'project' is an experience representative of a real life-situation. What it means in teaching is this : There is nothing in the nature of ideas about honesty or purity or kindliness which by itself translates such ideas into good conduct or character. You cannot teach morality *in vacuo* or from above. The teacher's question ought to be, not 'How can I teach this lesson ?' but 'How can I help John to be more thoughtful of his parents, to decide upon the best kind of life-work, or to do team-work ?' The school is to teach the child to think, to acquire ways of meeting life-situations, rather than to fill him with knowledge. Christian education aims to help the child to live as a Christian. This can best be done through actual experiments. A child in a class, for example, is ill. There is an opportunity. Let the class discuss what he would like. This will set them to tasks of a helpful kind, writing a letter from the class to the sick boy, making picture books for him, and so on. Then the children become kind through being kind. Or again, a severe accident that happens to a child raises questions about God's character, and these are

discussed with the class. A whole curriculum can in this way be drawn up for religious education out of actual life, but it has to be elastic, since situations are constantly occurring of which the teacher can take advantage. Mr. Shaver gives sketches of nearly eighty 'projects' and how they were worked. He also gives a list of scores of others and discusses fully how a 'project' ought to be gone about. He is wise enough, too, to perceive that traditional methods of teaching can be used, and ought to be used, in developing the 'projects.' His book is one of the most suggestive and fertile we have seen for long. It ought to be widely circulated. Even teachers who do not adopt it wholesale will find many pages in it stimulating in a high degree and useful in the most practical ways. We have heard of the 'project' idea before, but nothing so satisfactory in the way of exposition has reached us as this admirable handbook.

A HISTORY OF GREEK RELIGION.

Under the title *A History of Greek Religion*, Professor Martin P. Nilsson (Professor of Classical Archæology and Ancient History in the University of Lund) has given to the public in an extended form a course of lectures on the history of Greek religion delivered before the University of Upsala (Milford ; 12s. 6d. net). The excellent translation from the Swedish is made by Mr. F. J. Fielden. In the Preface, Sir James G. Frazer remarks that Professor Nilsson has long been known to scholars as one of the most learned and sagacious exponents of ancient Greek life and thought.

The volume is as remarkable for the author's independence and freshness of viewpoint as for his learning and mastery of the materials. In the first chapter he writes most suggestively of the pre-historic period, and in the last he comments on the popular Greek religion of to-day.

No literature, the author says, goes out of date so quickly as work on mythological research. Its ephemeral nature he attributes to the one-sidedness of so much study in this department. This is his explanation of the general failure to note a point that he regards as of great significance. The well-known cycles of Greek myth and legend have long been regarded as the creation of the Hellenic mind. In reality the great cycles of myths belong to the great centres of Mycenæan culture, in Crete and on the mainland, and presumably owe much to Minoan

and Mycenæan influence. It was in the second millennium that Greeks migrated into the country that was to be theirs; and Professor Nilsson feels certain that the Mycenæan fortresses of the mainland belonged not to colonists from Crete, but to Greeks who had adopted the Minoan culture. This theory of Greek mythology is elaborated with much erudition.

The heroes are not 'depromoted gods'; on the contrary, the 'hero-cult' is 'originally nothing but the cult of a dead man who belongs not only to a single family, but to the people in general.' Thus the heroes were regarded as ancestors, and the early history of the people was just the story of the deeds of the heroes. The hero is thus essentially local, being tied to his grave, though several graves may lay claim to the same hero. The rising belief in immortality seems to have been due rather to a revival of the cult of heroes than to the introduction of the cult of Dionysos, to which it has been attributed.

The distinguishing mark of Homer and all later Greek religion is anthropomorphism, which has its starting-point in animism, but owes something also to the folk-tale and the necessity of visualizing the gods; though where a god existed in actual form his development as a god was arrested. The sun-god, for example, hardly became the real object of a cult. Neither omnipotence, omnipresence, nor omniscience was ever fully possessed by the Greek gods, and in proportion as they were Nature-gods they had nothing to do with morals, 'the rain falls alike on the just and upon the unjust.'

Incidentally light is thrown on many Biblical passages; on the stories, for example, of Lot's wife, of Samson and of Jonah, and on the conceptions of animal sacrifice, hell, and the laying-on of hands. The volume is a valuable contribution, not only to the study of the history of Greek religion, but to the comparative study of religions in the widest sense. Note the distinction drawn between the two kinds of folk-tales and myths: the 'inventive' tale which has no definite end beyond the pleasure of the story itself, and the 'ætiological' tale, the object of which is to explain some phenomenon of later times.

BUSHMEN OF THE KALAHARI.

In *Pygmies and Bushmen of the Kalahari*, by Mr. S. S. Dornan, F.R.G.S., the well-known

traveller (Seeley, Service; 21s. net), we have the story of the explorer whose real mission is the study of Anthropology, as distinct from the Christian missionary and pioneer of Christian civilization. The purpose of Mr. Dornan's book with its numerous and excellent illustrations is to give an account of the hunting tribes inhabiting the great arid plateau of the Kalahari desert, their habits, customs, and beliefs, with some reference to Bushmen art and to the neighbouring African tribes. Robert Moffat, that notable pioneer among South African missionaries, settled at Kuruman on the borders of the Kalahari desert in 1821, and it was from his home that David Livingstone set out in 1849 to explore the desert and to discover Lake Ngami. Here is a far extended plateau between 3000 feet and 4000 feet elevation with the immense area of 140,000 square miles, sparsely peopled by the native tribes, but a hunter's paradise with abundance of beasts, birds, and reptiles, with an innumerable addition of spiders, scorpions, bees, hornets, wasps, centipedes, ticks, beetles, ants, mosquitoes, and flies in swarms. The seekers after big game in such a country find that there is more than enough of little game to make life a torment. Of the present inhabitants of the country the best known are the Bushmen and Bechuanas, by reason of the efforts of John Mackenzie and of their great chief Khama to save them from the disastrous overlordship of the Transvaal Boers. Mr. Dornan gives a full account of their origins and history, their family and religious life, with its omens, divination ceremonies, and totemism. There are a good many touches of Nature that seem to make these South African native tribes kin with European civilization. The Bechuanas are very keen on buying and selling just like certain highly civilized natives of Europe and America. The seller will hold out stiffly, asking generally more than he intends to take. Such a custom is not unknown here. Then they find that their native art in water jugs and pots is being destroyed by paraffin tins and other evidences of European civilization which have been dumped upon them. This experience is so common. Then the old games have gone out of fashion. In the old days a thick kind of porridge was made from the grain by women. To-day, instead, they eat bread baked in pots and drink quantities of tea and coffee. In like manner also do the natives of Scotland. Mr. Dornan's

chapter on 'The Cult of the Witch-doctor,' who is generally a male, contains a good deal that suggests the cult of the quack doctor at home in the twentieth century.

The views of Karl Marx have been sufficiently discussed to make them tolerably familiar to all who are interested in social and economic problems. It seems somewhat belated, therefore, to publish an address on *Value, Price and Profit*, delivered by Karl Marx in 1865, but it is felt that it contains a clear and summary exposition of the views more fully set forth in the first volume of 'Capital.' It is edited by his daughter, Eleanor Marx Aveling, and the publishers are Messrs. Allen & Unwin (1s. net).

It should be noted that *Christianity and the Roman Government*, by E. G. Hardy, D.Litt., Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, is now published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (5s. net). It has been out of print for some time, and it is good that this standard work is now accessible.

A Flying Visit to the Middle East, by the Rt. Hon. Sir Samuel Hoare, Bart., C.M.G., M.P. (Cambridge University Press; 3s. 6d. net), gives a brief but interesting account of the recent visit of the Air Minister to Mesopotamia. Questions of public policy are omitted, and the record is restricted to the less official aspects of the journey. The narrative is fresh and vivid, and the whole situation is dramatic—the great air buses speeding across the blue sky, while far below, caravans can be seen crawling across the desert, 'which might have been the Children of Israel moving forward into the Promised Land.' The sense of contrast is heightened by the excellent illustrations, for on the same page may be seen Ur of the Chaldees associated with three desert aeroplanes.

It will be remembered that Mr. Carveth Read, M.A. (Cantab.), published in 1920 'The Origin of Man and of his Superstitions.' A second edition has now been required, and the publishers—The Cambridge University Press—have issued the two parts of the work as separate volumes—*The Origin of Man* (5s. net), and *Man and his Superstitions* (12s. 6d. net).

Donald Macfarlane of Gigha and Cara, by Mr.

Sydney Smith (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), reads like the title of a biography of a notable missionary in some of the islands of the South Pacific. It is really the biography of a minister of the Church of Scotland in the West Highlands, of remarkable gifts and influence. Gigha and Cara are two tiny islands lying off the coast of Argyllshire exposed to the full fury of the Atlantic breakers. And yet in this very limited sphere this son and grandson and great-grandson of the Scottish manse was able to exercise a far-extended spiritual influence.

The Very Rev. J. N. Ogilvie, D.D., has brought his history of *The Presbyterian Churches of Christendom* up to date. The new edition is completely revised and is much enlarged (R. & R. Clark; 5s. net).

A further instalment of texts from Nippur is presented in *Sumerian Religious Texts* (Crozer Theological Seminary—Babylonian Publications, vol. i.). These were copied in Constantinople by the author, Dr. Edward Chiera, Assistant Professor of Assyriology in the University of Pennsylvania, and he holds in reserve another work on historical texts from the same site. In addition to this, mention is made in the introductory pages of 'a volume by itself' dealing with epic materials, and of another concerned with a legendary series relating to Babylonian origins. Numerous references to kindred texts already published are detailed. The impression conveyed is that while much has been done, a great deal remains to be done. The present work ought to be very useful when the scattered Nippur materials have all been assembled and made accessible in book form.

The name of King Dungi of Ur is here read *Šul-gi*.

*Our Communion*s, by the Rev. T. H. Passmore, M.A. (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d. net), is the work of a religious enthusiast. Whatever he believes he believes passionately, and the rush of his language carries him at times to the verge of incoherence. The volume contains three sets of three sermons each on Our Communion, The Biology of Prayer, and the Unjust Steward. In the first of these stress is laid on frequent communion, and 'the strange cultus of the first Sunday of the month' is declared to be 'a kind of moon-worship.' In the interpretation of the parable of the Unjust Steward the view is advanced that 'God is the Landlord of this

world, Christ is the Steward who dispenses it for Him.' The device of the steward in dealing with his Lord's debtors is represented as 'a wonderful picture of the Atonement.'

If any one wishes a really good teaching book on the Decalogue, or indeed on morality generally, he could not find a better than *The Two Duties of a Christian*, by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D. (Heffer; 4s. net). It is the fourth of a series of volumes of 'Lessons on the Way,' the others being on Christian belief. To say that this is a simple exposition of the Ten Commandments is to give no idea of its rich contents or its delightfully original and unconventional method. Dr. Dearmer writes as if he were talking to a company of boys, and no boy that we have met would find talk of this kind dull. The Ten Words in Dr. Dearmer's hands become alive with all kinds of suggestiveness and winsomeness. There is not a trite or dull page in the whole book. It will be a godsend to teachers and parents, but we can easily imagine that preachers will find a book like this full of practical hints, and any preacher who uses it in the right way will enrich his sermons immensely. If goodness can be imparted at all by instruction and inspiration, this is the way to do it.

Dr. W. Mackintosh Mackay has been urged—chiefly, he tells us, by his American readers—to add to his 'Bible Types,' and so he has now given us a series of Studies of the Apostles. The title is *The Men whom Jesus Made* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). And paradoxically the last chapter concerns Judas, 'The Man whom Jesus could not Make.' How does Dr. Mackay treat Judas? For if we see that we shall see something of his method. First, there is a psychological analysis of character. Dr. Mackay traces Judas' downfall not to political ambitions, but to jealousy because he was not first of the Twelve. Then, dishonesty, 'He began to keep for himself what he was supposed to have given to the poor,' and from that to hatred, 'He felt that he was seen through.' After his analysis of character Dr. Mackay draws two lessons. First, that privileges abused become a curse, and then, that sin is invariably lonely. The Studies make suggestive and interesting reading.

Critical Moments in British History, by Professor Robert S. Rait, C.B.E., LL.D. (Hodder & Stoughton;

3s. 6d. net), contains ten sketches which are expansions of some talks on history given within recent months from the Glasgow Station of the British Broadcasting Company. They are at once popular and instructive, and have all the charm which one associates with Professor Rait's historical writing.

Forty years have passed since the death, at the age of nearly 101 years of *Moses Montefiore*, that notable figure among the Jewish race during the greater part of last century. The full story of his public and private life was published soon afterwards, and the Jewish Publication Society of America have now issued a more concise record written by Mr. Paul Goodman with the entire sympathy and enthusiasm of a co-religionist. Among the many races driven from Europe into exile in the States of America there is undoubtedly a sufficient number of the children of Israel to justify this life-history of the man whose greatest aspiration and inspiration it was to see Palestine repopled by returned exiles. Moses Montefiore accomplished much in his day, but even his century of life did not permit him to see the Turk driven from Palestine and the dawn of the new day for the Jewish race in that country.

The Adventures of a Spiritual Tramp (Longmans; 5s. net) is Mr. Stanley B. James' account of his physical, mental, and spiritual wanderings—cowboy, soldier, minister in the Congregational Church, influenced in turn by R. J. Campbell and by Dr. Orchard, until in the words of Father Knox, who writes the preface to the book, he 'finds himself in Peter's net at last.'

Why did he find himself there? Well, Father Knox explains it this way. 'If Mr. James' career had followed the lines originally marked out for it; if he had passed straight into the Congregationalist ministry at the end of his educational course, he would have remained content, perhaps, in the closed circle of his own ideas. But a wandering, jack-of-all-trades life on the further side of the Atlantic had taught him the great lesson; he saw himself not in the centre of his world, but on the circumference of his world; he had learned to want a sun round which to revolve. To be a Protestant, and especially to be a Protestant minister, you must be your own sun; Mr. James tried it and found it impossible. So much human explanation you can give of the motives which repelled him into the Truth.'

Christians of To-Day, by E. Vera Pemberton (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), is described in the subtitle as 'Twenty-four Problem Lessons for Use with Adolescents.' The lessons cover a very wide range from Belief in God and Old Testament Difficulties to Politics, Recreation and Betting, the Life after Death, and Communion with the Dead. Curiously no single lesson is given to Jesus Christ or any distinctively New Testament problem. A clear outline of each lesson is supplied, with hints as to methods of teaching and the aim to be kept in view. Teachers of classes for lads and girls will find here much that should prove helpful.

Miss Florence S. H. Young, who has written *Pearls from the Pacific* (Marshall Brothers; 6s. net), has the pen of a ready and a graphic writer. She has so much that is interesting and at times thrilling to tell of her work as a missionary, first among the Kanakas in Queensland, secondly among the Chinese, and then among the heathen of the Solomon Islands of the Pacific, that she would have done better to condense considerably the story of her earlier years. She was in China at the outbreak of the Boxer rebellion, now almost forgotten in the story of recent events. But reasons of health obliged her to return to the work among the Kanaka labourers in the Queensland sugar plantations. Thence she undertook the bolder adventure among the heathen of the Solomon Islands, reckoning nothing of dangers or difficulties or discomforts well-nigh incredible. 'What patience and tenderness is needed,' she writes, 'to teach in broken English, with all its limitations, the Gospel of redeeming love, to minds which have never understood what true love is, and who have no conception of sin. And what a wonderful tribute to the power of the Gospel, that, even when inadequately spoken, it should have the power of renewing these debased heathen and lifting them into the image of Jesus.' From what varied fields of missionary labour has this message been sent home!

The Transfiguration, by Mr. J. H. Thompson, B.Sc., F.R.Met.S. (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net), is a minute exegetical study of the Gospel narrative. The writer disparages commentaries, which simply means that he would clear the ground for his own. His principle of interpretation is that 'every verse in the Bible may possess three meanings or interpretations, namely, (a) an actual meaning, (b) a

prophetic meaning, (c) a typical or spiritual meaning.' He writes in a devout and reverent spirit, but much in his interpretation is fanciful.

The Department of Philosophy of Columbia University has issued a second volume of *Studies in the History of Ideas* (Milford; 15s. net). The first volume, under the same title, appeared in 1918. The present work contains thirteen papers, covering a wide field, from the Socratic Dialogues of Plato and The Logic of Mysticism in Plotinus down to William James and the Development of American Pragmatism. It includes a paper on Unwritten Philosophies in which the writer, with great wealth of imagination, suggests that all ideas, enthusiasms, and prejudices, 'even a weakness for bananas or a fear of snakes,' might function for the production of philosophical dogma. The treatment, though whimsical, is a wonderful exercise of intellectual agility. The general tone of the volume, however, is marked by competent scholarship, acute criticism, and considerable distinction of thought. It forms a notable contribution to philosophic discussion.

'*And the Villages thereof*,' by Maud Elizabeth Boaz (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), gives a chatty account of the everyday life and work of a woman missionary in the interior of China. The book is brimful of incident and without a dull page. It is fitted to kindle the missionary spirit in youthful hearts, for the joy of the work shines over all. 'Is it worth it? Is it a happy service? These questions can be answered with an unqualified "Yes!" There are the disappointing days, the lonely days, the days when things look very grey, but *none* counts in comparison with the joy of the Lord Himself, which is our strength as the days go by—the joy of being used by Him, even in the smallest measure, to help and uplift others.'

Can a Man Be a Christian To-day?, by Principal W. L. Poteat, LL.D. (Oxford University Press; 7s. net), contains three lectures delivered to students under the McNair Trust. It may be said at once that they are in every respect admirable, and indeed of unusual distinction. Rarely does one meet with so much ripe wisdom, united with sound scholarship and adorned by noble diction. The first lecture gives a masterly survey of the intellectual conditions of to-day; in the second, under the title of Baggage, the distinction is elaborated between the essence of

the Christian Faith and the various forms through which it has been expressed in thought and life. In this connexion the Fundamentalist controversy is dealt with in a sane, conciliatory, and helpful way. The last lecture is entitled Peace, and points the way to a firm foothold in the realm of faith. Principal Poteat's conclusion may be sufficiently indicated by the following quotation: 'If you ask me what is a man of intelligence to do in this scientific period to preserve peace in the family of his ideas, I answer in one word: Consider Jesus. Press through a thousand professional interpreters to Him, see Him at His gracious ministries, hear His original, un-amended word. If A or B or C or D intervene and protest "Who are you to ignore the succession of rabbis and set aside the ancient formula?" answer "Only a lover of the Truth bent upon lighting my taper at the Master light, only a limping follower trying to keep in sight of Him, only a happy slave responsible to his Master alone and not another" . . . Press through to Jesus.'

The catholicity of the Student Christian Movement is well known (using the word in the sense of breadth of sympathy), but it is somewhat surprising to find it broad enough to include such a book as *Some Catholic Methods of Prayer*, by the Rev. H. L. Hubbard, M.A. (1s. net), which has just been issued by the Movement. The book is one of a series designed to help in the spiritual life, and the authors are expressly said to represent different religious traditions. Mr. Hubbard evidently belongs to the Anglo-Catholic tradition. He recommends us to begin by choosing a spiritual director, and defends the use of the Rosary and the devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Those whose religious tendencies are in this direction will doubtless find help in this earnest little book.

'Europe in ruins—can she be rebuilt?' This question has been confronting both the statesmen of Europe and America and the Christian Churches in all lands during the last half-dozen years. One result is that people have failed to realize what is actually being done, in more ways than they have any idea of, to grapple with the great problem. In *Rebuilding Europe* (S.C.M.; 4s. net), Miss Ruth Rouse, formerly Travelling Secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation, has written a most interesting and inspiring narrative of what has been and is being done by the co-operative under-

taking of the students of the world known as European Student Relief. At a time when there is so much pessimism about the supposed failure of Christianity to grapple with the problems and crying needs of the day, we see here how immediate was the opening of this campaign of practical help by the students of other lands for their comrades in the universities, colleges, and higher schools in the vast region of Central Europe devastated by the War.

A Family in the Making, by the Rev. R. O. Hall (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is described as 'a discussion of the place of the Christian Church and of the parson in God's purpose for the world.' The writer's comments on present-day life and religion are clear and vigorous, at times caustic. His words have an edge upon them, and as often happens in such cases they sometimes tend to caricature. Many of his observations, however, are singularly penetrating and arresting. In his view God's agelong purpose may best be defined as the making of a family. In the fulfilment of this purpose, while many agents have their part, there is a special place assigned to the Church and the parson. The whole Christian community is God's instrument, of which the parson is only the representative. Some striking things are said about 'the parson's job,' and not least this, 'if you are one of those people whom the "average" parson not only annoys, but makes furiously angry, the probability is that you ought to be a parson yourself. You could not be angry like that unless you had seen a glimpse of God's love for men. You have plainly got the passion which is so essentially necessary. And you will learn, being a parson will teach you, the necessary humility.'

Cantate Domino (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net) is somewhat of a literary curiosity. It is the hymnal of the World Student Christian Federation, and contains sixty-four hymns, each given in three languages. English, French, and German predominate, but thirty-two are in other tongues which no reviewer could hope to criticise unless he were able to talk his way to the Great Wall of China, and perhaps farther. The hope is expressed that 'these hymns, voicing the inspiration of many churches, many nations, many races, may symbolize the union of all Christians in the peace of Jesus Christ.'

The John Clifford Lecture of 1925 is now published

in greatly expanded form under the title of *The Growth of Brotherhood*, by the Rev. Arthur Dakin, D.Th. (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). It gives a clear and admirable sketch of the manifestations of the Christian spirit of brotherhood, first under the falling civilization of Rome, second amid the rising civilization of the Middle Ages, finally and much more fully in the expanding civilization of the modern world. The writer convincingly shows how brotherhood has succeeded where force has failed, and in his outlook upon the future he is optimistic enough to believe that the same force, under the inspiration of the Spirit of Christ, will work out a better world order. The whole treatment is most fresh and illuminating.

There have not been many volumes of children's sermons lately, so one by the Rev. W. J. May, *The Mother of Iscariot* (Teachers & Taught; 3s. 6d. net), is specially welcome. But it is welcome for itself also. Mr. May's parables for children are already well known to the readers of this magazine. In his present book, however, he takes a new line in which he proves himself as much a master as in the old one. The method is to choose a Bible story and allow

his imagination play upon it, filling in the local colour—'local colour' is the expression used on the jacket of the book, a phrase which has become popular since the publication of *The Local Colour of the Bible*—and carrying the story a step farther than the Bible does, and so successfully that one feels that the conclusion is the inevitable one.

In *The Marvels of Modern Physics* (Watts & Co.; 2s. 6d. net), Mr. Joseph McCabe continues his work of giving to the man in the street a vivid and understandable account of some of the wonders of modern physical science. In this book, avoiding mathematical formulæ and technical phraseology, he writes most instructively about the structure of atoms and electrons, the mysteries of light and wireless waves, and the ultimate constitution of the universe. The picture, he says in conclusion, 'is only an outline sketch. Our knowledge is still very superficial. But enough has been said to show that physicists have achieved a remarkable triumph in the course of the last hundred years. The living thing, which has been the toy of the elements for hundreds of millions of years, is becoming their master.'

Psychology and Religion.

BY PRINCIPAL W. ROBINSON, M.A., B.Sc., OVERDALE COLLEGE, MOSELEY, BIRMINGHAM.

PSYCHOLOGY is—so to speak—in the air. It has left the halls of learning and descended to the pavement. It is now available in lecture form for all who are prepared to absorb it, and books on the subject—good, bad, and indifferent—are literally pouring from the press. No doubt there is a good deal of charlatanism connected with this popularizing of the subject, and not a few people are rapidly making fortunes from many who are only too willing to cast money into the lecturer's coffer, which once they quite as cheerfully bestowed upon the purchase of patent medicines. Such is the glamour of the subject that very few people stop to inquire the credentials of a would-be lecturer, and fewer still doubt his infallibility or question the potent magic of his ware. There is, of course, some gain in this

popularizing process, but it cannot be doubted that it is also attended by serious danger; for people are acquiring a smattering of the subject without making any serious attempt to master it in its details. But be this as it may, the fact is that psychology is no longer a kind of luxury science which most people might neglect without serious loss, neither is it any longer to be classed with occult sciences—though much of the popular interest in it is unfortunately occult enough at bottom. Psychology is now no longer a subject to be studied by educationalists alone: it enters into the lives of the medical man, the economist, the criminologist, the minister of religion, and it meets us in our daily newspapers. Moreover, men everywhere have a sort of (very often vague) idea that

it has to do with religion and theology, and some even imagine (let it be admitted that they have not generally thought very deeply on the subject) that it has given, or is about to give, the death-blow to religion in every shape and form. But let us see.

Over fifty years ago Archbishop Temple declared that it would soon be necessary to rewrite theology, not in terms of metaphysics or logic, but in terms of psychology. We are not, therefore, surprised to find the following from the pen of his son, the present Bishop of Manchester: 'The true case for Theism does not rest upon general Philosophy alone, nor upon religious experience alone, but upon the coincidence and convergence of these two.'¹ That both the prophecy and the statement are profoundly true there can be no doubt, for in a very real sense psychology is a new science—in fact, it bids fair to be *the* science of the twentieth century, as biology was of the nineteenth—and undoubtedly theology will have to come to terms with it; for psychology deals with human experience of which religious experience is a real part. But in another sense psychology is not new (though a good number of present-day psychologists seem to be unaware of the fact). No one who has read Aristotle, or St. Thomas Aquinas, or the Old Testament, or the mass of literature constituting Roman moral theology, can doubt that psychology—the thing itself—has never been absent from the theistic argument. True, there are any number of forms of the argument which have ignored it and have preferred to rest their case solely upon logic and metaphysics; but there is a line of witness to the truth of theism which has never lost sight of the fact that religious experience is a real factor which cannot be neglected. Indeed, Schleiermacher preferred to rest the whole case for theism on religious experience, and not a few both sophisticated and unsophisticated Christians have been prepared to follow him. That he went too far in his claims there can be no doubt, and, as Dr. Temple shows, we should prefer to rest our case on the convergence of religious experience and philosophy. But on the other hand science, which has satisfied itself almost entirely with empirical methods and has, in the main, eschewed philosophy, has strangely enough adopted a cavalier attitude towards *religious*

experience, often dismissing it quite contemptuously as unreal. But the facts of religious experience are as strictly empirical as the facts with which the positive sciences deal, and they cannot be dismissed in this way. Psychology is bound to take account of them, and has already begun to do so.

It is often asserted, and more often assumed, that theologians are slow to take into consideration the results of scientific investigation and that this is the sole cause of the conflict between science and religion. Be this as it may—and it is a very doubtful assertion indeed—it cannot be denied that in the matter of psychology, far from being slow to take up the results, the very opposite has been the case. Theology has been for the past fifty years gradually restating itself in terms of psychology. The number of books on the subject which has issued from the press, written by theologians of repute, is sufficient witness to this. So much is this the case that it may be felt that some have rushed in where angels would have feared to tread. Every important book on the Philosophy of Religion, and not a few on the great doctrines, which has been written since the days of Martineau, has been full of psychology. Much has been gained, but not all. Many have been so confident that they have looked to psychology to heal—and that right speedily—all the quarrels of however long standing which stand to the account of science and religion. That psychology will eventually assist in this great task there can be little doubt. But we may question the over-confidence of such a statement as the following: 'Psychology has opened up lines along which one may look to see effected that reconciliation between science and religion, the attempt to secure which led to an *impasse* a generation ago.'² Rather we may anticipate a real conflict between psychology and religion, a conflict more severe than that between biology and religion. In fact, signs of the conflict are already evident and will become more so as the New Psychology, with its special methods of investigation—psycho-analysis and auto-suggestion—becomes more fully developed.

But when the conflict comes it will not really be new: it will be the old conflict between naturalism and theism in a new dress. There are signs of over-confidence on both sides. Some theists, as we have seen, are ready to assert that psychology

¹ *Christus Veritas*, 39. The book is perhaps the most complete statement of theism in terms of psychology that has yet appeared in English.

² Quoted by Professor H. R. Mackintosh in *Some Aspects of Religious Belief*, 200.

will heal all the festering sores, and close all the gaping wounds which the nineteenth century has bequeathed to us; and many psychologists are already claiming that psychology is about to give to religion the final death-blow, which biology was unable to administer. But is psychology really capable of doing either of these two things? What is its proper function and what its proper domain? These are questions which need to be answered, and to a large extent they are being ignored. The simple fact seems to be that just as biology was able to give us a clearer understanding of how purpose and design are wrought out in the creative process, so psychology is attempting (and has already achieved a good deal) to explain to us how the religious consciousness works. Further, just as many self-confident naturalists and determinists imagined that to know how purpose and design worked was to rid ourselves once for all of a Purposer and Designer—that explanation meant final explanation—so the same class in the ranks of psychologists are asserting that to know how the religious consciousness works is to resolve all religion into subjectivism—to deny any outside influence on the human mind. That is, they are not satisfied to exploit the findings of their science to bolster up a mechanistic view of the universe, but they start their study of the subject with mechanistic preconceptions. They are prepared to beg the whole question from the start. From another point of view we may claim that they are treating psychology, not as a science able to supply data for philosophic discussion, but as a branch of metaphysics itself. And others who are not prepared to go so far as this, but who have the same presuppositions, are using the results of psychology—illegitimately, I think—to bolster up mechanism, much in the same way as men half a century ago were using the results of biology.

The fact is, as Professor McDougall has pointed out in his *Outline of Psychology*, that there are two classes of psychologists and two methods of studying the science.¹ We may start by regarding all events as links in a mechanical chain of causation—and that not merely as a methodology within the field of our science—but as a true and ultimate explanation of all things. Or we may start by admitting purposive striving as something entirely different from mechanical sequence. Professor McDougall himself started out along the first way

and found it very inadequate. He tells us that this 'mechanical psychology naturally and almost inevitably adopts the atomistic or mosaic theory of mental processes. . . . When it seeks to explain the clusterings and sequences of these elements, it does so by imagining each one to be attached in some manner to an elementary brain process; and it seeks to explain the conjunctions and sequences of the elementary brain processes in a purely mechanical fashion, by aid of laws of the physical and chemical sciences.'² He further claims that such psychology is decidedly preponderant at the present time, and frankly admits that his own work is a polemic against it. As he says, nothing is to be gained by slurring over the issue: there can be no real advance until it is resolved, until there is general agreement upon fundamentals. The fact is that psychology touches the issue between mechanism and teleology far more closely than ever biology did. Biology, dealing as it did with the principle of life, came nearer than the physical sciences; but psychology, dealing as it does with psychical states, comes nearer still; and that is why it is that the conflict between psychology and religion will be fiercer than any that has yet been. Professor McDougall regards mechanistic psychology as resulting from oversimplification. 'This tendency to simplification is in fact the root of the mechanistic mosaic psychology, that which describes mental processes as made up of static elements, units of feeling, atoms of sensation, particles of mind dust, neural entities or what not. And this type of psychology is still with us and still predominant. Its latest exponent, Mr. Bertrand Russell, has performed the service of reducing it to the lowest level of banality in his *Analysis of Mind*. Recently it has begotten upon psychology a most misshapen and beggarly dwarf, namely, Behaviourism, which just now is rampant in this country (America).'³ He is, however, hopeful for the future and sees welcome signs of something better in the work of such men as Henry Head in England, and Pierre Marie and Bergson in France, as well as in the turn of the tide in Germany since 1900.

What we have said so far will serve to show clearly that psychology is not all of one type, and we must not be blind to this fact. Both theology and philosophy have greatly benefited from the results already achieved; but the real question at issue is

¹ See the Preface.

² P. viii.

³ P. ix.

whether these results are patient of a mechanistic interpretation, or whether they demand a purposive explanation of the universe, and I submit that this is a question which psychology, *qua* psychology, cannot answer. It can supply the necessary data for the discussion, but the discussion itself must be carried out in the field of philosophy, to which field psychology—it may be admitted—is related more closely than any other science.

Further, we must remember, when discussing the bearing of psychology on theism and religion, that psychology only deals with one phase of human activity. The psychological interpretation of religion is not, therefore, in itself complete. It must be supplemented both by philosophy and history. Religion, especially the Christian religion, is grounded in history, and so far as Christianity is concerned, it has more than once successfully combated attempts to wholly absorb it in philosophy, as it will equally well resist any attempt to finally explain it in terms of psychology.

The study of the psychology of religion naturally brings into prominence the subjective element, and this has led many to suppose that it resolves all religion into pure subjectivism. Religion, they say, is merely the 'projection' of human desires, hopes, and fears. The real question, then, is whether religious experience is a mere projection of the subliminal consciousness, or whether it is the result of genuine intercourse with a higher Being. Is it just the product of auto-suggestion, or is it real communion with a spiritual world? Here, again, it is necessary to emphasize that psychology, *qua* psychology, cannot answer this question. Psychology is concerned with processes and their results and not with final explanations.¹ Because I know as a result of psychological investigation *how* the mind works, say, in the process of conversion, I am not therefore able to say *why* the mind so works.

¹ Dr. Selbie in his recent book, *The Psychology of Religion*, points to two modern German psychologists who maintain that it is the proper province of psychology to pronounce on the truth or falsity of religious ideas, Georg Wobbermin and W. Stählin. Of this position he himself says: 'While psychology naturally and properly indicates the part played by the intellect in religion and insists on its usefulness in purifying our intuitions and selecting among them those which have a right to dominate the mind and heart, it cannot pronounce definitely on the truth or falsehood of religious ideas, or on the reality or validity of the objects of religious faith or worship' (p. 62). He justifies this position throughout the book.

Psychology cannot deal with the objective reality which may or may not lie behind the experience. It may supply new and important data, but the question as to objective reality is, strictly speaking, a philosophical one. It is quite inadmissible to deny on the ground of psychology that there is any objective reality behind religious phenomena, and to conclude, as many do, that psychology justifies the view that religious experience is purely subjective and the result of auto-suggestion or hetero-suggestion on the human level. Such a conclusion altogether neglects philosophical, ethical, and historical considerations which must be taken into account, and, moreover, passes over in a most shallow fashion the tremendous results which, in the course of the world's history, have sprung from religious experience. With some psychologists it would appear that auto-suggestion has become a kind of universal solvent with which religious experience may be quite safely treated. Unfortunately this is a case of 'biting off too much,' for the solvent will be found to be equally potent with all other forms of experience. In this connexion we may claim that that form of Pragmatism which justifies the idea of God as useful, but will not allow that it is in any sense true, that is, that it corresponds to any reality, is not really justifiable on psychological grounds. At any rate, if the idea of God corresponds to nothing objective, but is merely the result of auto-suggestion, we are in no better case with the rest of our ideas, whether in the fields of philosophy or science. It may be difficult to make the plain man see this, but it is nevertheless true that this kind of Pragmatism lands us pretty much in the same place as Hume's scepticism: it strikes at the roots of science equally as at the roots of religion; for it really means that we can be certain of nothing beyond our own individual existence. As Professor Pratt says: 'Important as is the pragmatic element in the God-idea, it is not the only element. And any attempt to prove it such is both bad psychology and bad epistemology. Bad psychology because it neglects altogether certain real elements in the religious consciousness, whether found in philosopher, priest, or humble worshipper,—men who through all the ages have truly meant by "God" something more than the idea of God, something genuinely transcendent. Bad epistemology because based ultimately upon a viciously subjective view of *meaning*, a view which would identify our objects with our

ideas of our objects, and which, carried to its logical conclusion, would result in solipsism.' ¹

We may safely reject all those theistic arguments based on the religious consciousness, which rest their case *solely* on intuition or on isolated individual emotions, and which renounce both logic and metaphysics. They are not of themselves broad enough for us to base our belief in God on them. We may therefore refuse to follow both Schleiermacher and the modern exponents of intuitionist theories, who are constantly urging us to forsake intellect for instinct. But when we have done so we have to reckon with the fact that religion is a normal thing in man's experience—it is universal. And it is not sufficient to explain this in any of the ways common to mechanistic psychology, and say, for example, that it is due to man's tendency to personalize—to give flesh and blood, so to speak, to his ideas. For, apart from the doubtful truth of this assertion, when we have accepted it we cannot in any sense regard it as a final explanation. It only tells us *how* man's religious consciousness works. It does not tell us *why* he has a religious consciousness. After all, the real question is why does man have the tendency to personalize—to give objective value to his ideas, and why does he have such ideas at all? Or again, if we accept the dogma that man's religious experience arises by the process psychologists call projection, that it springs from the subliminal consciousness, that it is merely the result of his giving reality to the objects of his desires, his hopes, and fears (all, again, a very doubtful explanation and not at all adequate): we have not in any sense reached a final explanation. Again, we have only stated *how*, and have still to explain *why*, man universally possesses these hopes and fears, and why universally he tends to clothe their objects with reality. Neither will it do to say that man creates God in his own image, just as a child personalizes its playthings. Nor do we really get anywhere by pointing to anthropomorphisms (blessed word) in primitive conceptions of God, and then going on further to say that if it could a cow would make a cow-god and worship it.

¹ *The Religious Consciousness*, 209. The whole work should be read. See also Rudolph Otto's epoch-making book translated into English under the title *The Idea of the Holy*. So far as this book is concerned, its importance cannot be easily overestimated. For the next generation at any rate, no one will be able to write on psychology and religion without coming to grips with this book.

We may here be describing the process by which man comes to worship God, and some may be able to accept such a simple description; but it is in no sense an explanation; for we have yet to inquire *why* men do make God in their own image, and why everywhere they seek after Him if haply they may find Him. The simple fact is that cows do not worship cow-gods, while men everywhere—at whatever stage we find them—do worship a supreme being or beings. And this fact needs explanation. It is either due to chance or it is natural to man. But chance explains nothing, and we are therefore shut up to the conclusion that man is by his very nature religious. However different the idea of God may be at different levels, there is an underlying similarity which testifies to the fact that it is neither artificial nor manufactured, but a normal possession of the human race. Man even when he acts instinctively reaches the same goal as when he consciously reflects. Reflectively his reason finds God necessary to explain the universe, but at the lowest stages he finds the same necessity to rest in powers outside himself. Moreover, it is out of this attitude of man that the development of conscience has sprung and the evolution of society in general is no less dependent upon it. If the religious consciousness be not real, how are we to explain development within its own field? If the religious idea be not valid, if it corresponds to nothing real, then so must everything which has been built upon it be invalid, and we may as well relinquish ourselves to complete scepticism in the field of knowledge and sarcastically inquire with Pilate, 'What is truth?' For the religious consciousness is never a matter of pure feeling; even at the lowest stages there are elements of knowledge as well as of will and emotion, and wherever there is knowledge there is some distinction between subject and object; there is no such thing as purely subjective knowledge.

We may claim, therefore, that psychology is not only passing outside the limits of its own domain, but pronouncing on a matter on which it is not capable of giving judgment, when it states categorically that religious experience is purely subjective and the result of suggestion; and we may look forward to work of real value being done in the field of religious psychology providing psychologists will rid themselves of this *a priori* supposition, which is little more than a superstition.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Some Dunce.¹

'Morning by morning he awakens me to learn my lesson, and never have I disobeyed or turned away.'—Is 50⁴.⁵ (Moffatt).

'MORNING by morning he awakens me to learn my lesson: and never have I disobeyed or turned away.' Here is a man, you see, who says that every day he lives he learns something new. And surely we too should all be doing that in this glorious world with so many splendid things to see, and such a heap of them to ask about (Father, why this? and Mummy, why that?), and scores and scores of lovely ploys to do, and such exciting adventures always happening to one.

It is just like some of you fellows when you were off for summer holidays, who couldn't pack all that there was to do into the longest day; and wouldn't stay in bed one moment after the sun wakened you, but were up and away. There were so many things to see, the birds in their nests, and the rabbits popping out of their burrows, and the squirrels racing round and round the trees, and, oh, so many others (how were they all after the night?), you just hadn't a minute to spare, but must get to them at once. And so the very second your eyes opened, you were out of bed and off. And, says Isaiah, every morning God comes and wakens me, and says, 'You're not still lying fast asleep in bed are you? Why, there's another day come hours ago! And there are heaps and heaps of glorious things to learn and see. Up! up! and come with Me, and I will teach you something splendid.' And he says, I always leap out from under the blankets and begin the day at once, wouldn't miss a moment, for every one of them is better and more interesting and exciting than the last.

I wonder if we do that, you and I. Or if, when they waken us, we grunt sleepily and turn over; and the next time they come—'Yes, yes,' we cry, 'just getting up,' yet off we drop again! And when we do get up, we can so dawdle over dressing, can't we? Why, we can easily waste whole ten minutes in the bathroom, playing with a sponge, and watching how much water it sucks in, and lets none

of it out again! And so it is all through the day. We fritter it away, and don't learn much. When in the evening we sit down to lessons, perhaps we don't really try much, don't stick in. But, because they are hard, we lose heart, and fling away the book. 'I can't,' we say. How can I ever get these horrid Latin verbs into my head; or learn in spelling all these dreadful words in 'ough,' or remember whether the 'e' or the 'i' comes first in 'piece' or in 'receive'? We don't try much. But this man says that he did try, did do his best, and did learn something every day. And so do you too, in a way, in lots of ways indeed. The teacher sent you a message the other day down to the Infant room; and it seemed so funny to you to see them sticking at quite simple things, at easy words like 'tell' and 'say' which you could read so easily. But once they were as hard for you. You're getting on; are learning something every day; can read far quicker, and can spell much better, than you used to do; can add now, and subtract, and even multiply a little, though the eight times bothers you. Oh yes, you're getting on in English and arithmetic. But God, you know, has a class where He teaches us the best of all the lessons, how not to sulk or whine, not to be selfish and grumpy, and catty, and all that kind of thing. And I wonder if you are learning much from Him. 'Come,' He says, 'and I'll teach you something every day.' But are the days and weeks and months slipping away, and leaving you as cross and as peevish as ever? Are you learning, in God's class? Some of His pupils have done splendidly, the horse for one. For all kinds of creatures are in God's class; it's a lovely class to be in, not only boys and girls, but birds and beasts, and every kind of thing. The horse has been a glorious pupil, has tried hard, and learned a lot. Long, long ago, you know, horses weren't one bit like what they are now; they were quite small, perhaps some eighteen inches high, just wee poor things. But God said to them, 'If you listen to Me, and learn day by day, I can teach you how to grow big and strong and swift and beautiful.' And they did listen, and did learn; and look at them to-day, how wonderful they are! But there were other creatures in God's class that wouldn't work at all. Long, long ago there were horrid beasts like the things you see in

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

nightmares, when you waken screaming, and just must have Mummy. They had the tiniest heads, these ugly brutes, and no real bodies, were all neck and tails. And they were huge, bigger by far than any beasts are now. And nobody like you or me, you would think, could have got away from them. For, even if you did climb up a tree, they would just shoot out their long, long necks and pick you off the topmost branches; horrid brutes! But they're all gone. Because they wouldn't learn. 'Come,' said God, 'and I'll teach you to grow wiser and better every day.' But they wouldn't. 'We don't need to learn,' they said; 'are far stronger than any other thing,' and stuck where they were. And little creatures who did learn, grew cleverer and wiser, by and by passed them, and took away from them their lordship of the earth, and killed them in the end, and a good riddance too, the ugly crawly things. And there is one creature in God's class that has been sitting in it now for millions and millions of years, and all that time it has learned not one thing. You may be pretty slow, but fancy sitting in the infant class millions of years, and still be unable to read one atom better than you could the first day you went there! The wise men have found in the rocks lingulas who lived, oh, so dreadfully long ago: and the lingulas living now are just the very same; they have learned nothing, not one thing in all that time. The horse has changed altogether: and men have grown from savage things to what they are to-day, have learned whole heaps and heaps, how to make fires, how to write, how to put on clothes, how to stand up on two feet, how to speak, how to read, always they are learning something new. To-day it is wireless, to-morrow it is flying. But the lingula has learned not one thing. It is the dunce of God's class. But is it? Are you learning any more than it? How old are you? Six, seven, ten! And though all that time God has been teaching you not to be cross, you are cross quite often even yet! Are you a dunce too, like the poor lingula? Well, here is another chance coming to us. For God is a very, very kind and a very, very patient Teacher. And so He stoops, and lifts you on His knee, and is not one bit angry, puts His arms round you, and says, 'Yes, little one, I know it is very hard. Still, we shall try again, and this time we may manage, you and I.' Wouldn't you like to learn, how to please God at last, how to be good-tempered and unselfish and the glorious things He teaches in His class?

A Good Report.¹

'Having obtained a good report.'—He 11:29.

I met a schoolboy in a tram last week. He was bubbling over with gladness, and before I had time to ask him what was the reason of it all, he broke out in that stammering way we have when life seems crammed full of good things, 'We've broken up—and I've got a good report.' The grim old man who was sitting near began to smile, and I expect he began to think over the times when he went to school. I wonder what sort of report he used to get, although perhaps they didn't learn all the hard things we do, and perhaps they didn't trouble about reports. Somehow everybody seemed to share the boy's good spirits. When he reached home there was more fun still—father and mother were as jolly as he was, and indeed his father, who is a preacher, said he could understand now that story of the great Teacher about the good servants who heard the Master say, 'Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord,' for something like that had happened in their household. Jim could do nothing wrong that day—father and mother had a blind eye—perhaps two blind eyes, which is better still—for all his faults, because in their hearts they were saying all day, 'He's got a good report.' None of the troubles of the term mattered now, although behind that report there were plenty of troubles. The report, for example, just said 'Times late—o,' which looked splendid, but oh! the rush sometimes to get that record—especially once, when he had gone to the cinema and the bed pulled so hard the next morning. He didn't find time for much breakfast that morning, but never mind, there's the report. And the Latin! Well, he always liked that, and he was first in the form. As for the Maths, that was a puzzling business, but he had gone up from tenth to fifth place, and the report said, 'He is working hard at this subject.'

Then in church he heard this lesson read about folk who, like himself, had earned a good report. Now, they were folk to be interested in. Some of the Bible folk were a long way off, but these seemed to come very near. What had they done? What did their report say? He found they had to put up a fight for it, but then who wants a good report unless it tells the truth about a bit of real work. There wouldn't be any fun in it, if it did not represent the best thing a fellow could do, and these folk had

¹ By the Reverend R. Strong, M.A., B.Litt., Norwich.

been through the storm. The writer's words came tumbling out. What mighty words they were too! 'They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword, they went about in sheepskins.' No wonder that God admired them and was not ashamed to be called their God. That's rather like the boy's father, who is so glad himself about this result that although he doesn't say much he goes about as if he were proud to be the father.

This is part of the joy of God when we plod on to the end through our disappointments and difficulties, keeping our faith alive right to the end, and so gain like these splendid ones of old 'a good report.'

On the 'Phone.¹

'Continue in prayer.'—Col 4^a.

You all love 'listening-in,' I expect, and by this time Uncle Wex, as a little friend of mine calls him, and the other uncles at 2LO seem quite like old friends. But don't you ever feel when 'listening-in' at the Children's Hour, or when some great singer or player is delighting you with lovely music, that you would like to talk back, or at least say 'Thank you.' That is a privilege that 'wireless' cannot give you as yet.

But there is another wonderful invention—so common now that we forget how wonderful it is—that does give you that privilege. If you are 'on the 'phone,' you will know all about it. For, by the telephone, you can not only listen to people miles, hundreds of miles away, but you can talk to them as well. It is this that makes the telephone a beautiful illustration of Prayer.

Sometimes when we call up somebody on the 'phone we get no answer—the person we want is not there. In the Old Testament there is a story of some people who called on their god Baal, and though they called in desperate earnestness from morning to evening, no answer came through. But we pray to the real God, the living God, and He's always there, never too busy to listen, waiting to answer.

Sometimes when you get on the 'phone the person you want is engaged with somebody else, and as long as the line is engaged, you have no chance of speaking to him. But children in India, China, Africa, as well as in England, can all ring up upon this 'phone to Heaven, and the great Father

attends to them all, attends to them each. Multitudes of prayers are going up to Him at the same time too, but He can pick out your little prayer, and has a special answer for you, and there is nothing to pay. When you use the public telephone you are not put through until the lady at the Exchange hears the pennies dropping, but the high privilege of speaking to God is without money and without price.

Sometimes the telephone wires get broken. During the War the enemy often tried to cut the wire between headquarters and the firing-line. It is a serious thing when the line is cut. The man in the firing-line may be in great need of reinforcements, but how can he let his General know if the line is broken? And sometimes the prayer-line is broken.

Sin cuts the wire. 'If I regard iniquity in my heart,' said an old Psalmist, 'the Lord will not hear me.' How could He? Indeed, if we are indulging in any evil way, we are not likely even to ask Him, Sin makes God deaf and us dumb.

Mr. Fullerton tells the story of a Bible-woman who used to visit the sick folk in Leicester Infirmary. One day as she was leaving a ward, a young doctor stopped her, and said, 'Well, Mrs. Copley, I suppose you have been telling these people that God hears prayer?' 'Yes, sir,' she said, 'my Father always hears His people when they cry.' 'I am very glad to hear it,' said the doctor, 'for I am very hard up this morning. Do you think that if I asked your Father for a five-pound note He would give it to me?' She replied, 'Suppose you were introduced to the Prince of Wales, do you think you could put your hand in his pocket the first day you knew him, and ask him for a five-pound note?' 'No-o-o, I suppose I would have to wait until I knew him better,' was the reluctant reply. 'Yes,' she said, 'and you will need to know my Father better before you can ask Him for five-pound notes.'

Any unkindness or wrong-doing to others cuts the wire. Our Lord taught that, if our brother has anything against us, it is no use to offer God our gifts. And if we have done anything mean or wrong or shabby to any 'brother' of ours, we must first be reconciled to that brother before we can offer our gifts of prayer.

That reminds us that, though the wire be broken, it may be mended. But only One can mend it—Jesus. We have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins. When we are shy and

¹ G. C. Leader, *The Gate of Pearl*, 31.

awkward with God, because of our sinful thoughts and ways, it is the Lord Jesus who makes us friends again. We are 'reconciled to God through the death of his Son.' And so the connexion is restored, and if we 'abide' in Jesus, that is, if we keep on following and obeying Him, the line keeps unbroken between us and the Throne of Grace.

And it means a great deal to keep that line unbroken. Prayer makes all the difference even in the work of life—yes, even in lessons, however hard and dry they seem.

Mr. Richmond, a famous painter, once found for a whole fortnight that nothing went well with him; his hand seemed to have lost its cunning. He told William Blake, another great painter, his trouble. Blake turned to his wife suddenly, and said, 'It is just so with us, is it not—for weeks together when the visions forsake us? What do we do then, Kate?' She said, 'We kneel down and pray.'

The Christian Year.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Loving God.

'We love, because he first loved us.'—I Jn 4¹⁹.

I. *The Spring of Love.*—What have we to start with? What will send us forth to win the great prize which life holds out? There is this. The certainty of being personally loved.

The certainty of it lies in the command that is laid upon every conscience. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.' It is individual and personal, addressed to each of God's children without any distinction. And the demand it makes carries with it the assurance of love. We do not and we could not ask for the love of any one for whom we had no care. To say to our friend, 'The only thing I ask of you is your love,' is to assure him that we love him.

To every one, then, comes the great news that he is loved by the best and the highest, that the One Being whose love is most worth having is already pledged to his care, that however grim, sordid, or sad his life may be, the rainbow is always in the cloud, the light of God's countenance always upon him.

II. *The Practice of Love.*—For every man there is the great fact of God's love. But there are many, even of those who know something of its personal side, with whom it never becomes a power. The reason is that while they have recognized the gospel

that lies in the command 'Thou shalt love,' they have not gone further and tried to put it into practice. They have shrunk from any serious examination of the claims of the old yet ever new command, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.'

The command runs in that way because Divine Love calls for an answer that will be akin to itself. The sacrifice of the will, the intelligence of the mind, the emotions of the soul, the practical power of the strength, are but different aspects of that reflection of the Divine Love which bears down upon us. For the Divine Love is not single, is not complete in one expression. We can trace at least four characteristics which make up its conception: Self-sacrifice, Wisdom, Beauty, and Humility.

1. The first aspect is the love with 'all the heart.' All the heart of man leaps forth to all the heart of God, and we long to place our wills in His will—the 'heart' here, according to the best lexicographers, means 'will.' 'To love him with all the will.' Is this what He asks for? This, then, we will give. With Saul on the road to Damascus, when first Eternal Love was revealed to Him, we say, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' And we expect the answer to be clear, definite, decided, so that we can move at once, and freely. And there is nothing of the sort. 'It shall be told thee,' and the telling means darkness, doubt, hesitation—many, many years of delay, here a little, there a little, and only slowly the purpose getting clearer. It is eight years after his conversion before St. Paul goes on his first missionary journey, and fourteen before the plans of his life's work as Apostle to the Gentiles really becomes plain to him in the vision of the Macedonian. We are surprised. We had thought that once the will was surrendered there would be no doubt. We did not expect to find, as the great Apostle found, that we should encounter objections and controversies, that some Peter would have to be withstood to the face, that some Barnabas would have to be left, that important people would have to be consulted to see if what we supposed to be Divine will were right. Yes, the giving up 'the will' does not mean that it is a perfect instrument because it is surrendered. It has to be shaped and pointed, to be made strong and steady.

The love of God with 'all the heart' or 'all the will' means not only patient care in discerning what

the will of the Lord is, and stern self-surrender in following it even when it is contrary to our interests, but a ceaseless willing along the path of God's will. It is in the daily exercise of prayer that we are to exercise this power. We are to discover that prayer is not a cry of despairing weakness, but a great force setting in one or in another direction great currents, scattering enemies, unloosening, as it were, and setting free 'God's will to move according to the proper law of God's will; God's will which is the crushing of evil, and the life of love and joy. By prayer we are instruments of God's will to bear with victorious omnipotence against evil—the evil which ensnares and torments—ourselves, or our dear ones, or our brethren in all the world.'

2. As the will moves in obedience to the Divine self-sacrifice, so the soul in response to Divine beauty. In the soul God has given us a wonderful instrument by which we can make the response His beauty calls for. As the will is expressed in strength, so the soul in feeling. And as the love with all the heart finds its natural channel in prayer, so the love of 'all the soul' in worship. Worshipping then becomes a joy and exhilaration, for into Psalms, Canticles, and Hymns we pour all the emotions by which we have been stirred. It may be some act of self-sacrifice of which we have read or heard, which finds a natural place when we throw it, as it were, into the Ocean of the Sacrifice of the Son of God, giving a fresh meaning to the old words, 'We give thanks to thee for thy great glory,' not only reflected in Calvary, but in the deed that has moved us. It may be some beautiful scene of hill or valley, the recollection of which gives a new meaning to the lines, 'In his hand are all the corners of the earth, and the strength of the hills is his also.' Or some teaching on the Incarnation has stirred us, and we sing with new force, 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour'; or some fresh vision of God's love has quieted and calmed restless feelings, and we can sing with Simeon, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace.' In this way, worship becomes a real response of the soul to the touch of God, a rekindling of the faculty of admiration and devotion.

3. We must now examine what lies under the claim made for 'all our minds.' Shortly we say, that as Love must be unselfish and warm, so it must also be intelligent. We must love with all the capacities

and powers of the mind, and we must also love with all the range of the mind. It is no easy thing to arrange the complexity of our intellectual interests. What is to be done not only with the newspaper, the magazine, and the novel, but with the study of history, science, or law?

The method of our forefathers who were much troubled by the new world of romance that was opening out at the beginning of the last century was stern and unbending. 'Throw away the books, banish the newspapers and magazines, rigidly limit the claims of study and give your whole mind to the Bible.' But we can make no such sharp distinction between what is sacred and secular. All knowledge is of God. Through history, science, and philosophy we learn to know Him better, and are brought nearer to Him. We are not, then, inclined to exclude, but rather to include. And suddenly there is a cry made 'The Bridegroom cometh,' and we are brought sharply up with the rough reminder that our life is half-spent, and that our real knowledge of God is no larger or deeper than it was twenty years ago.

When we are face to face with our difficulty we remember again that Life is a response. All these yearnings that knowledge stimulates, these mental struggles that it creates, are our endeavours to give an intelligent response to Him who is asking so many questions, are the promptings that will lead to love with all the mind. He rejoices in the scholar who, laying aside all pleasure, is giving his mind to the expression of Truth. He encourages the prophet poet who is ever diving deep into the ocean of Wisdom in order to find some clue to its mystery and sing of it to the world. But He sadly wonders why so little attention has been given to the method He Himself has pointed out.

4. 'With all thy strength.' Here is Love's last demand. The body revered and won by countless acts of discipline is never for itself, but always 'for the Lord.' And therefore, following along the footsteps of His great example, we take it and reverence it in order that we may break it. It was no solitary experience that led the faithful Elizabeth Gilbert, who used her gift of blindness with such remarkable results, to say, when one of her friends hoped that she was not working herself to death: 'Work myself to death? I am working myself to life.'

As the love of the will becomes manifested in unselfishness, and that of the soul in spiritual beauty;

as the mind when devoted to God becomes filled with wisdom, so the love of God with all the strength brings out the special feature of the Incarnate Word which each one bears.

'What was it,' writes Mr. Brierley, 'that Charles Lamb saw on the countenance of the Quaker ladies on their way to the Bishopsgate meeting making them "as troops of shining ones"? Very much, we suppose, like the smile that people saw on the face of St. Vincent de Paul, and which transfigured features which were in themselves homely to ugliness. It was the gleam of the supernatural in man, the shining through mortal flesh of a sun behind the sun.'¹

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Reverence.

'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.'—Ex 3⁵.

Very noteworthy is the unanimity with which the gifted writers of last century gave to reverence a high place, and almost the highest place, in the holy family of the virtues and the graces. In a well-known passage in *Wilhelm Meister*, Goethe declares reverence to be the essence even of religion. This conception was taken over by Carlyle, who, with characteristic heat and iteration, insisted on 'the indispensableness of reverence,' and insisted on it the more because in the form which it assumes in hero-worship—in loyalty and obedience to the great man—he saw the only hope of making much of the stumbling hordes of our weak and foolish world. Ruskin preached it as unweariedly as Carlyle, while practising the virtue more consistently. And the philosopher Martineau describes it as 'the apex and crown of character.'

It is true that from the point of view of Scripture this strain of panegyric may seem exaggerated. In the teaching of Scripture some other things are counted more important—as repentance from sin, faith in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, obedience to the holy and righteous will of God. But, while reverence is certainly not the be-all and end-all of religion, it appears in Scripture as an indispensable symptom and accompaniment of true religion. Religion, when it is a heartfelt reality, necessarily shapes for itself a ritual eloquently expressive of dependence upon God, of penitence, adoration, and trust. In the homage of the bowed head, the closed eyes, and the shoeless feet, in the

appeal of the outstretched hands, in the ritual of bodily prostration and the putting on of sackcloth and ashes, the piety of the Old Testament found expression no less picturesque than vehement. We may also recall how Jesus Christ inculcated and practised a deep reverence for God's name and His works, when He bade us to swear neither by His throne nor by His footstool; for His Word, which He warned us against making of none effect by our traditions; for His house, which He cleansed of an unholy traffic; for the image of God in man, which He discovered even in the most insignificant, degraded, and wretched of the children of Adam, and because of which He taught us to attach to the individual soul a value exceeding that of all the material wealth of a world.

1. *The modern decay of reverence.*

(1) To begin with, there has been a marked change in the relations of what the Catechism calls superiors and inferiors. We have witnessed a general up-rising of the inferior. One of the most noticeable features of family life in recent times is the self-assertion of children, who at the best offer their parents affection rather than reverence. It is a common remark of middle-aged people that they would never have dared to address their parents in the way in which their children speak to them. In earlier times the common mind was much impressed by the apostolic injunction not 'to speak evil of dignities'—which was interpreted to mean that every one in a public station, from the king on the throne to the magnate of a parish, was to be protected from malicious and contemptuous criticism by the dignity of his position. To-day there is a vast number of people whose intellectual luxury is to talk the language of detraction, and perhaps of calumny, about those whom they dislike because of their superiority to themselves, or only because of their greater success in life. The change is, of course, no matter of regret so far as it means that even the greatest must now submit to moral criticism, and also that there is a decay of the spirit which Thackeray satirized in the *Book of Snobs*. But there is still a virtue which lies half-way between irreverence and servility.

(2) There is also much irreverent handling of great themes. There has been a rather noticeable change in the general tone as regards the providential order of things, and the sacred and solemn things of human life. Occurrences which were formerly spoken of with reverence as the acts of God are now treated

¹ G. H. S. Walpole, *Life's Chance*, 81.

unthinkingly and habitually as the subject of complaint or jest. Experiences of human life, with which are bound up so much of its beauty and pathos, furnish the occasion of an infinite output of frivolous thought and speech. Birth, love, marriage, death, and the domestic relationships are found to have their amusing aspects, and to provoke the witty sallies of the brighter spirits.

(3) The decay of reverence has also been increasingly apparent in the sphere of holy things, narrowly so called. As touching God's Day, it is possible to think that there was too much of the Old Testament in our traditional method of Sabbath-observance, and at the same time to hold that it is an irreparable loss when the Sunday ceases to be observed as a day dedicated to worship, to serious reading and reflection, and to works of mercy. The Word of God, when it is not treated with the utter neglect which is the extreme of irreverence, is often made use of in a way that would have shocked the piety of an earlier age. As touching God Himself, it will hardly be disputed that there has been a general weakening of the sense of the presence and rule of the Almighty which was a characteristic note of the religion of earlier days, and that few draw near to Him with the reverence and godly fear that befits the finite and sinful creature in making the approach to an infinite and all-holy God.

The human spirit, however, is very complex, and there is another side which must in fairness be recognized, and which even shows in certain fields a growth and deepening of reverence. There has been evident in our time, apart from the temporary check of the war, a growing reverence for man as man. It was said that one of the most distinctive features of our Lord's teaching was that He emphasized the unique dignity and immeasurable value of the soul of man as a being made in the image of God, and this has entered deeply into our modern thinking. A profound reverence for human life, a high estimate of the value of all that appears in human form, underlies the extraordinary zeal and energy which have been directed in recent times to the relief of the sick, the infirm, the aged, and even of the insane and the criminal.

And, another striking fact, of similar character, is the growing reverence which is felt for childhood. It has been said that children do not seem to revere their parents as in former days, but there is an offset to this in the fact that parents now show much

more reverence for their children. There is a deep realization of the immeasurable possibilities that open out before the young, an earnest desire that, avoiding our sins, they may escape the punishments which followed, and a prayer and a hope that they may be guided and used as instruments in bringing in a better and brighter day in our old sad world.

2. In what way can we cultivate the *spirit of reverence*?

(1) It is generally agreed that for the instilling of reverence much depends on the character of those with whom, in the formative period of life, a child is brought in contact. It is in reverence for parents and teachers that the culture naturally begins, and those are unfortunate indeed who did not discover in their home life the objects that draw out the instinctive capacity for reverence. This point was strikingly put by Carlyle in a reference to the influences of his own childhood, 'The highest whom I knew on earth I saw bowed down with awe unspeakable before a higher in Heaven. Such things, especially in infancy, reach inwards to the very core of your being; mysteriously does a Holy of Holies build itself into visibility in the mysterious deeps; and reverence, the divinest in man, springs undying from its mean envelopment of fear.'

(2) In the second place, it should be pointed out that for the culture of the spirit of reverence no small importance attaches to outward acts. In the book already referred to the wise Goethe taught that if children are to imbibe the spirit it ought to be expressed in attitudes, postures, and gestures which symbolize the attitude of the reverent soul towards the universe around us, and to the God who has been revealed to us in exaltation and humiliation. The reverent action, when it has become habitual, is a constant summons to reverence of soul.

(3) And lastly, let us remember that the grand object, and also the enduring spring of reverential feeling, is God. For human experience is to some extent a process of disenchantment in regard to those who were idealized and glorified by the optimism and faith of youth. The imperfections of our nearest are painfully, if unwillingly, realized. We outgrow many of our early heroes, we are disappointed in many of our friends. The great need of our minds is so to realize God—the Almighty, the All-wise, the All-good—that He supplies a permanent factor in all our serious thinking, a sacred vein in our deepest feeling, and a powerful incentive in all deliberate and weighty actions. And because

it is difficult for us to apprehend Him in His transcendence and His infinitude, He has drawn near to us in Jesus Christ—so that we can behold His glory in the face of one like to ourselves, can believe that he that hath seen Him hath seen the Father, and may be drawn by His word and His grace into the experience of the life of God.¹

—
TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Valley of Dry Bones.

'Son of man, can these bones live?'—Ezk 37^a.

The situation on which Ezekiel looked out was sombre enough. When Jerusalem was captured, the conquerors carried through a relentless sifting of the nation, and all that was brave, well-born, intelligent within it—the nobles and leaders and craftsmen—were singled out and banished, and only, as the historian allows, 'the poorest sort of the people' were left, and they, with a king to match them, went straight for the abyss. The exiles were handled with real political skill, with the deliberate purpose of extinguishing the national life. Their patriotic spirit was broken, and an ignoble contentment laid hold upon them, so that they did not desire to be other than they were. How could such men build up a nation?

Ezekiel tells us how the situation looked—like some ancient battlefield, where the dead had long been dead. There were not even groans of the stricken to suggest that something might still be done, but an unendurable silence. Beast and bird had had their will, and over all the valley floor there was strewn the indiscriminate litter of human bones. He wandered round the field, and wherever he turned death confronted him—death which had already forgotten that life had ever been; and when the outspread desolation had sunk into his spirit, the question rose within him, 'Can these bones live?'

1. There are times in the history of the Church which resemble the time of Ezekiel.

God takes the man of little faith, takes him like Ezekiel, carries him back in spirit through history to the dark ages of Europe. He sets him in the valley of the dark ages, when the Spanish Moors had more light and life than the Christians of Europe. He asks him, 'Can these bones live?' He cannot say, but God's answer is the wonderful eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

Or, again, God takes him onward, and sets him

in another dismal valley, the church of the Borgias and the Medicis, amongst the parched bones of faith, when the former revival had shrunk to a mere renaissance, when Paganism was not in the Empire, but in the Church's own heart and head. He points him to the wicked Church of all the cultures at Rome in the valley of the fifteenth century, when the faithful had all but ceased to be. 'Can these bones live?' He sees not how. God's answer is Luther, Calvin, and the sixteenth century, the rediscovery of St. Paul, the coronation of faith, the vitalizing of Europe, Puritanism, the birth of democracy, the rise of constitutionalism, Free Churchism, and the dawn of modern times. No, the past is not dead.

And once more He plants him by the English Church of last century, with Deism outside, and drought within, but no thirst. Can they live? God's answer is Wesley and the Evangelical revival, Newman and the Oxford revival.

2. There are times in our Churches to-day parallel to that in which Ezekiel lived.

What preacher but is cast into occasional despair by the question of the text as he looks upon many spiritual skeletons about him? What preacher has not many a time to answer, with Ezekiel, that they can only live by some miracle of God; he, poor son of man, has failed, and is hopeless. He is preaching, perhaps, out of duty more than inspiration; he often prophesies in obedience rather than in hope. Well, preach hope till you have hope; then preach it because you have it. 'Prophesy over these bones; call out to the Spirit,' says the Lord.

But it is not with bones or mummies that the preacher has chiefly to do. He comes, let us say, and lifts a vital voice. He is a man of parts and force; he collects a following, he is the centre of an interesting congregation. It looks well, comfortable; it is no skeleton crowd, it has flesh and blood. What is lacking? Perhaps the things that are not revealed to flesh and blood, the unearthly lustre in the eye, and movement in the mien, the Spirit of Life.

The bones are clothed, but not quickened; they know about sacred things, but they do not know about the Holy Ghost. So prophesy once more, Son of man, saith the Lord. Prophesy to the Spirit of life; preach, but still more, pray; invoke the abiding Spirit to enter these easy forms.

Preach to them great things. Let the trivial rubbish alone that occupies too much of our Church interest. It is possible to lose the soul in the effort to

¹ W. P. Paterson, *In the Day of the Ordeal*, 147.

win souls. Dwell less upon the minor truths, dwell more upon the mighty truths which grow mightier by iteration. Take care of the spiritual pounds, and the current pence will look after themselves.¹

3. There are individual lives where the question arises, Can these bones live?

Sometimes it looks as if a man were going to be drawn right over into the kingdom; his interest grows and deepens—and then he turns away. ‘There is no breath in him,’ and yet the most careful observer cannot point to any reason for the failure. In conversion one meets with instances of a sunny and beautiful ease. ‘As I reached the end of the sentence,’ says Augustine, ‘the light of peace seemed to be shed upon my heart, and every shadow of doubt melted away.’ But without any warning, you run in other cases on obstacles irremovable, which almost justify Pascal’s terrible saying, ‘You will understand nothing of the works of God, if you do not start with this, that He has made some blind and some to see.’ ‘The wind bloweth where it listeth,’ said Jesus.

But is that the final word? It is good for men to feel their limitations, and to realize that this business of transforming a life passes human wit and force; that drives them back on God. But is it true that God makes men blind? And does His Spirit come on men, desultory and inconstant, like the wandering breeze? Jesus bade us do good to all, ‘despairing of no man’; can it be that He Himself despairs? He told His friends that whoever had seen Him had seen the Father, for in Him they might see what God is like; and throughout His life, from first to last, there appears an unchanging patience of hope.

God’s Spirit is like the sea, beating up against the shores of every human life, besetting, invading at the slenderest invitation, and then transforming. And thus the business of preaching is not to call on men to wait for exceptional outbursts of the Spirit of God, but even now to stand aside and give God His way, as He seeks to give and to do for us.

I deem that there are powers,
Which of themselves our minds impress,
And we can feed this mind of ours
In a wise passiveness.

‘A wise passiveness,’ that is faith; to draw back the obstructions of our pride and independence, to be content that He should be the Doer and we the

¹ P. T. Forsyth, in *C.W.P.* lxi. 314.

receivers, that is what God desires, and this miracle of Divine renovation waits on the consent of our human will.

When Fitzgerald wished Carlyle to leave London, he says, ‘I tried to persuade him to leave the accursed den; and he wished—but—but—perhaps he did not wish on the whole’; and in that mood no extrication is possible. Augustine notes in his *Confessions* how when mind commands body there is obedience at once, the hand moving so promptly that it is hard to distinguish wish from performance. But when mind commands mind there is rebellion. ‘Whence and why is this anomaly? It does not will wholly, and therefore it does not command wholly. It is not the full will that commands . . . This “will and will not” is no anomaly, but a sickness of the mind, weighed down by evil habit, so that it cannot rise wholly even when it is uplifted by truth.’ Ah, some of us are like these half-awakened figures of the prophet’s dream, with bone and flesh and some surface look of life; we are interested and inclined to believe in truths and powers which are Christian, but we have never given that whole assent which lets God have His way. In us He can do no mighty works; and it is for an ancient reason, because of our unbelief; and the Lord Himself, as He sees us troubled by mean cares and by some instinctive dread of God, and finding nowhere any remedy for care, says from His heart, ‘Oh, that my people would hearken unto me; for then would their peace be like a river, and their righteousness like the waves of the sea!’²

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Romance of Two Wills.

‘Wilt thou be made whole?’—Jn 5⁶.

‘The Son quickeneth whom he will.’—Jn 5⁴¹.

The romance of this story of Bethesda lies in the meeting of two wills—the will of the Son of Man who ‘quickeneth whom he will,’ and the will of the impotent man, who has only this germ of potency left within his paralysed being that he is willing to be made whole.

1. Let us look at the meeting of these two wills by the pool of Bethesda. We shall speak first of *the will of Christ the Saviour*. For in His own reflections upon this incident of Bethesda, amid the controversy which immediately followed, we find these words: ‘The Son of man quickeneth whom he will.’ There is a fine note of royalty about the

² W. M. Macgregor, *Some of God’s Ministries*, 204.

phrase. Royalty—not arbitrariness—a glorious and defiant assertion of His own independence of human restraint in working out the works of His Father. He refuses to be trammelled in His working by the prejudices of the Jews : ‘ the Son of man quickeneth *whom* he will ’—yes, and *when* He will. Indeed, He also refuses to be trammelled even by the likelihoods of circumstance, or the heavy fetters of human despair ; He glories in an unlikely case, and triumphs over it in the fullness of Divine energy ; He heals a man who has been thirty-eight years in his infirmity, and thrusts him like an emblem of hope before the eyes of despairing humanity : ‘ the Son of man quickeneth *whom He will.*’

Think yourself back for a moment into those shadowed porches by the pool, crowded with sick and weary folk, waiting for their chance. Christ comes into the midst of them and His will begins to work. First, it works like a searchlight. You have seen the searchlight of a warship flashing round a horizon on a dark night, revealing the ships at sea, the fortifications on shore, the people on the beach, huts, houses, palaces, with its moving, momentary gleam, so swift and so revealing. So we may see Christ’s will moving round that dismal company, revealing, considering, deciding. Then His will comes to rest upon a certain man : it resolves itself from a searchlight into an electric energy : it directs itself upon him in the question, ‘ Wilt thou be made whole ? ’ So the two wills meet : the man has his chance : if there is will in him to respond to redeeming will, nothing is impossible.

Is it possible to gain any insight into the principles on which the will of the Saviour wrought by the pool ? It is not like Him to be arbitrary : even when He is most royal, He is not arbitrary : there is a sweet reasonableness about Him, which we expect to find here because we find it so continually. The impotent were all round Him that day : why did He choose one over against the rest ? May we not say that this man was chosen because he was the neediest, because he was the most friendless, because he was the most helpless ? There is a poetess who, thinking out with herself a reasonable doctrine of Election, sings :

Need shall my witness be
That I am loved of Thee . . .
Nor will Thy soul reject
Him whom Thou dost elect

To be Thine own through weakness, search, and need,

This man might have taken these words into his lips. The Friend of the friendless found him out because he was friendless : the good Physician came straight to him because he was most in need.

The fact is that in this scene by the Pool of Bethesda we are watching the inauguration of a new era, dawning at last upon a world that has been waiting for it long. As Dr. Matheson puts it, the law hitherto has been the survival of the fittest : that law still holds in the porches of Bethesda : see how the strong hold back the weak at the critical moment, and how those who have friends to help them push aside those who have none. Here comes One into the midst, of whom you might almost say that the law of His Kingdom is the survival of the unfittest, the survival of the unlikelyest—One who allows the lame to take the prey, and who gives the Kingdom to the sinful, the weak, the poor, and the helpless. Welcome this glorious election ! We may be willing to be counted among the poor and needy, if so be that, because of our poverty and need, He thinketh upon us.

But whether we can always see the principle on which it works or not, that Sovereign Will, imperious and divine, is still working among us. It may seem impossible to reconcile a world ruled by Almighty Will with a world in which there is room for finite choice. But sometimes we have to accept conflicting opposites and leave their reconciliation to the day when we have a larger light. How can we reconcile the two ideas of pressure and tension in any solid body ? Physicists tell us that in any solid body such as a block of wood, every particle of matter attracts every other and yet at the same time repels it. We cannot think to ourselves the going-out of these two forces from the same atom at the same moment in the same direction—force of attraction and force of repulsion : it is unthinkable ; yet though it is unthinkable it is true. And in the same way it may be impossible for us intellectually to reconcile the Sovereign Will of God with the free will of man, yet both alike may be realities. The point where the practical issue emerges is this—that however many be the points of life at which God says to us ‘ I will,’ there are some points at least where He says ‘ Wilt thou ? ’

2. So now let us turn for a moment to *the other will*, which might seem a comparatively weak and small factor in the case, but upon which really hung the last issue of that fateful hour. ‘ *Wilt thou ?* ’

The help of God had come near : the man had his chance : it lay with him to seize it and to use it.

Those who work in the slums of great cities, where the devil's castaways are found among the rubbish-heaps of life, sometimes find that their initial task with a human life is to awaken hope : if that can be done, everything is done : if that cannot be done, nothing is accomplished. Can you imagine the rekindling in this man's eyes of the light that had faded for many days ? Desire this long time had been a bitter pain, because unsatisfied. Desire, as by a magician's touch, was now transformed into joy, for hope once more was mixed with it, and the man's will was caught in the grasp of Christ's Will, to find that it was a good will, full of power and promise. And his consenting will was the point at which the electric energy of that greater Will touched him and entered into his life : he arose, took up his bed and walked : the sad porches of Bethesda knew him no more.

There is a lesson here for *the threshold of the life divine*. Willingness is that threshold. There is no other. Nothing can take its place. There are ways and means by which the appeal of Christ's Sovereign Will still knocks at our door. It may be in a sermon. It may be in some sudden and silent thought when we are alone and the doors are shut upon our fellow-men. It may be in some solemn event of Providence, or in some sharp reminders of the flight of time. But it says to us 'Wilt thou ?' as truly as if that message had been spoken to us in the syllables of articulate speech or written on the sky in living flame. However it comes, it is our chance.

Speaking of the modern tendency to regard crime as merely a disease, Mr. Chesterton says : 'The fallacy of the whole thing is that evil is a matter of active choice, whereas disease is not. If you say that you are going to cure a profligate as you cure an asthmatic, my cheap and obvious answer is, Produce the people who want to be asthmatics as many people want to be profligates. A man may lie still and be cured of a malady. But he must not lie still if he wants to be cured of a sin.' *He must not lie still*. He must at least be active and alert enough to answer 'I will' to the Divine 'Wilt thou ?'

But the lesson of the threshold is also a lesson of *perpetual obligation*. Christ's Will is mighty : how mighty this man found when the healing poured into him. But we are not meant to make that might a temporary refuge. Our wills are weak.

Our impotence returns upon us. The world and our habits are strong. We need to keep close to Christ's sovereign and conquering Will all along the way. Again and again we need to re-unite our wills with His, that His may be to us not only guidance but power.

Renew my will from day to day :
Blend it with Thine.

And He whose Will was energy to the impotent long ago, will answer our self-surrender by enduing us with somewhat of His own great strength. To submit to Him is not overthrow, but victory. To keep His Will enthroned over ours is not bondage, but health and liberty.¹

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Soul's Three Tenses.

'One thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal.'—Ph 3¹³ (R.V.).

That is a very remarkable summary of a life's programme, of a whole outlook and attitude of the soul, and it is none the less remarkable in that it comes from a man whose earthly race is almost run, who has lived an exceptionally full and strenuous life, and is now writing from prison, with the prospect of death hanging over him. It is a strange thing to us that a man so beset should write a letter so serene, so uncomplaining, as this Epistle of Paul's to the Philippians. Isn't it more likely, says the sceptic, that the whole thing was invented, and the letter written years after the alleged events by some scribe who merely imagined the scene and surrounding conditions ? Some years ago, Mr. Chesterton, dealing with just this sceptical temper which dismisses as untrue whatever is sublime, wrote a most stimulating essay on 'The Heroic that Happened,' and gave instance after instance of events, actions, and sayings that ought to have been legendary, only they chanced to be absolutely historic.

Well, now we turn to our text 'forgetting the things which are behind, this one thing I do—I press on toward the goal.' That is the summary of a life's programme ; it denotes a definite outlook, it gives us the soul's three tenses.²

1. *The past tense of the soul*—'forgetting the things which were behind.'

It was Bergson in recent years who startled and

¹ J. M. E. Ross, *The Christian Standpoint*, 91.

² J. Warchauer, *Challenge and Cheer*, 132.

illuminated our minds by telling us that the true function of the brain is not to enable us to remember things, but to enable us to forget things. That but for this power which a sound brain has of shutting off certain floods of recollection which are irrelevant to the purpose in hand, our entire past would at every moment come crowding in upon us, every separate memory claiming to have as good a right to be there as any other, the consequence being that we should be unable to deal definitely with any immediate issue.

St. Paul is saying in the well-known verse which is our text, that it is God's gracious Will about us, His gracious permission towards us, that we should forget certain things. It may have been that the Philippians were troubling themselves about the treatment which Philippi had given the Apostle. It may have been that they were ashamed of themselves and of others, and that, with St. Paul now a prisoner and perhaps never to return again, their shame and grief over themselves had become an agony.

For certainly it is the case with us as we get older, if at the same time we are getting finer, that it comes to be not enough for us to believe that God has forgiven us for what we may have done or may have been ; we cannot forgive ourselves.

Now, perhaps there is no deeper question than just this : How are we to deal with ourselves in the light of things of which our conscience accuses us ? This is a question which man has put to himself from the beginning, a question with which the great literature of man has laboured as in travail through all ages. It is the burden of the Bible. It is the problem of Greek tragedy. It is the almost mad-dening preoccupation of the great Russians—of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky.

The answers which have been given to the question fall on the whole into two classes. On the one hand, there are those who say that the proper and only sensible way is not to trouble oneself for a moment about such morbid shadows ; that when a thing is done, why, that is the end of it ! Now it would be quite sound to base our practice upon a saying like that, if it were true. But it is not true. When a thing is done, that is not the end of it ; and for various reasons. One of those reasons is, that you or I who did the thing are still here. Another reason is, that this thing which we did, we did towards another, or towards others.

And then if this world of ours is a place which means a moral order with a Holy God behind it—

why then, what we did, and our own uneasiness about what we did, are matters which we cannot for ever be satisfied to have treated as though we had done nothing more than switch off a leaf from a tree in a forest as we sauntered through it carelessly.

But there is another answer—the answer of the tender-hearted, the scrupulous, the believing. And what is that answer ? Well, it is this. We also believe that in some way we must be enabled to forget the things which are behind ; but it must be not by denying the reality of those unhappy feelings, but by accepting them, and by accepting ourselves in the light of them.

The deepest thing in Christianity is the offer of forgiveness, the promise given us by our blessed Lord that in a deep sense we might forget the things that are behind. But it was to be a forgetting as a means towards a holier and wiser condition, of which the basis should be this very experience of the charity of God. It was to be a new *action* of the entire man, facing himself, accepting himself, made soft by penitence, made strong by faith in God's understanding of him and acceptance of him ; and all for the sake of a new life along the line of this new insight which already had made the old life henceforth insupportable.¹

2. *The present tense of the soul*—‘this one thing I do.’ One thing—no limping between two opinions, no good-natured open-mindedness which leaves convictions to strenuous souls who do not understand how to say ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ in the same breath. One thing—no frittering away of life's energies on a dozen objects, all, perhaps, good in themselves, but all of them demanding the first place in the interest of those who would pursue them with success.

‘One thing I do’ is the principle that produces success in so preponderant a proportion of cases that we may fairly set it down as a universal rule. Yes, but what is success when it is attained ? The little child achieves success when he masters the art of spinning his top. John Couch Adams achieved success when he traced to its hiding-place among the stars the distant planet Neptune. Between these two successes there lies a whole world of varying achievements, great and small, not often renowned among men, according to the true scale of greatness. The success of selfish scoundrels who pile up their millions by ruthlessly ‘cornering’ the livelihood of the masses—such a success may be

¹ J. A. Hutton, *Loyalty : The Approach to Faith*, 240.

as truly built on the maxim of our text as the success of the man who first brought to Europe the gospel message of God's love to men. The maxim is therefore neutral, unmoral, a mere formula which governs the accomplishment of any object, good or bad, which a man may set himself to gain. So everything turns on the object which is aimed at by this strenuous concentration of effort.

Something within a man is always telling him, until he stifles it into silence, that he was meant for immortality, for an endless sequence of ever-widening accomplishment and responsibility which will expand with the growth of powers created in the image of the Infinite God. Here is what St. Paul speaks of as the upward calling. Out of the depths of his heart one of the giants of human history is telling us of the Divine voice which he hears, and which he would fain make us hear. There was a time when his own ambitions were strangely different, though pursued with the same single-minded energy. Christ laid hold of him. And to lay hold of Christ, the prize now set before him, became his master-passion.

Yea, thro' life, death, thro' sorrow and thro' sinning
He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed;
Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.

3. And so we reach *the soul's third tense—the future*—'I press on toward the goal.'

If only we knew how to make the kingdom of Christ on earth the one end of life, and everything else a means to that end! The upward calling sounds to us to-day with a voice clear as in the days

when St. Paul followed it, and its watchword is still the same. If serving two masters has become more and more difficult in the spheres of ordinary life, it has not become easier when the highest ideals of man are concerned. One Lord, one faith—one ambition, one reward—everywhere that Divine number rings in the ears of him who would please God. John Wesley's rule for his helpers, 'You have nothing to do but to save souls,' is not meant for any one class of Christians alone; it belongs to all. For there is not one method only of saving souls. The aim to win human lives by the example of a life that belongs entirely to Christ is one which must be supreme in every real Christian's heart, but it will work itself out in many ways. So it falls that the voice which bids every disciple say, 'One thing I do,' calls him to do many things, because he will do them all to the glory of God. The Master bids His servants eagerly enter every field of human activity to claim it for Himself. They should be foremost in the pursuit of knowledge, for all truth is of God. They must be foremost in every systematic work for the alleviation of human suffering, for their Master ministered to the bodies as well as the souls of men. In Parliament, to see to the passing of good laws; in local government, to watch over everything which tends to the purification of life in town or country; in business, to promote justice and brotherliness between employers and employed; in all these things and many other spheres, in countless different ways, one thing they do, for every task they accomplish is done for the glory of God, which is the good of men.¹

¹ J. H. Moulton, *A Neglected Sacrament*, 144.

Buddhism and Christianity.

BY KENNETH J. SAUNDERS, M.A., LITT.D., PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

III.

WHILE missionaries and monks can co-operate in such movements as the 'Brotherhood of Religious Friends,' described in a former article, there is much bridge-building waiting to be done by the laity.

The Japanese Government is active in organizing educational propaganda abroad; its exhibits of art are well known at international expositions;

and whoever studies Japanese art is inevitably drinking in the spirit of Japanese Buddhism. The French Government has lately sent a good exhibit to America. Is it too much to hope that our Government can rise to such heights of intelligence? Why not send to Japan some of the masterpieces of Western art—the best of which are as much a

product of Christianity as Far Eastern art is of Buddhism? Money spent in such ways is better spent than in fortifying Singapore or holding on to Wei-hai-wei!

But if constructive internationalism is as yet beyond the purview of governments, it is the central business of the Church to promote peace and goodwill amongst men and to help all nations to bring their gifts to the Christ.

Artistic peoples like the Japanese have not yet had revealed to them a beautiful expression of Christianity: the vast mass of even educated Japanese have seen nothing but the ugly side of our civilization; this they were too quick to imitate, but from it they are now recoiling.

Why not at this critical time show them the Christian heart of all that is lovely in it in the form of a small but superb collection of its religious masterpieces, asking in exchange a similar collection of the great works of Buddhist art? My friend Dr. Anesaki and I have confessed to one another the thrill with which we each discovered the great things of the religious art of a different civilization. He in his visit to Italy fell in love with Saint Francis of Assisi, and the art of the Quattrocento; he says that he understood Christianity anew through its masterpieces. I in my visit to Japan came under the spell of men like Shinran and Nichiren, and found infinite illumination in the great things of Buddhist art. To see the Chion-in in Kyoto is like seeing St. Mark's, Venice—it is a great illumination.

That is one suggestion, surely not very difficult to carry out. Are Japan and China to know us only by our ugly industrialism and our utilitarian architecture, which are invading them apace? Right understanding is the only sure basis for respect and a true internationalism.

Now in this sphere it is quite obvious that if the Buddhist peoples of Japan and the Christian peoples of America and Europe cannot put the principles of their religion into practice, the future is dark indeed. It is also clear that if they fail—others will fail. The Buddhist, believing in the words of his Master, that 'Hate cannot cease by hate, but only by love,' and the Christian, called by his Master to 'judge righteous judgment,' and 'to cast out fear by love,' can they not get together?

The present missionary enterprise has been called the one indubitable Christian flag still flying. In many ways it is worthy of this tribute. It is true that its hospitals, its schools, its generous relief

work, are all examples of a loving ministry in the name of Christ. And yet it remains true that for the most part the missionary enterprise savours too much of a campaign, and too little of an adventure of magnanimous friendship. It is surely time for the Christian Church to offer to co-operate with Buddhists fully and without reserve, in such things as temperance movements, campaigns against prostitution, projects in education, whether of adults or of children, and, above all, in the great and central enterprise of world-friendship.

Let thoughtful Buddhists and thoughtful Christians come together frequently as they have just done at Honolulu for conference, and find out the religious bases and the moral ideals which they hold in common. Let them enter upon a noble emulation, each seeking to outdo the other in magnanimity and in the spirit of adventure. Neither party need fear. If Buddhists are more loving and more constructive than Christians, then Christians should not hesitate to acknowledge it, and to seek the hidden sources of such superior power. If, on the other hand, Buddhists find Christians moved by some Divine power of which they themselves have not the secret, let them freely and cheerfully acknowledge it. It is surely true that the spirit of Christianity may be trusted to win the victory if it be given free course. The spirit of Christ Himself can only pass between men who are friendly to one another.

To put it in more concrete language still, why should the Christian Church hesitate to help in training teachers for Buddhist Sunday schools, secretaries for the Y.M.B.A., or any other type of leader which in the course of its history it has learned to train and to employ? Why should the Buddhist architect not show the Christian missionary how to build a church which suggests an Oriental Christianity, and does not look like a bad copy of a Mid-Western conventicle? Why, above all, should the Buddhist and Christian not unite in such enterprises as the scientific study of the race problem, and the penetration of the press with a spirit of true internationalism? Here is ample scope for the laity of both religions.

And these are only a few of the many projects in which idealists everywhere are equally interested. It may be that Buddhist sects co-operating in these things with Christian sects both will learn to resolve their own internal difficulties. I remember visiting a Buddhist priest in Kyoto. Across the way was a temple almost identical with his, and having the

same central doctrines of salvation by faith and of the need of moral earnestness, and expressing their common creed in an identical ritual. 'Do you get on amicably together?' I asked him. 'We fight like brothers,' was his genial reply. And I thought at once of the insane sectarianism of some of our own Churches, and of the inefficient and sinful waste of energies which might be diverted to humaner purposes.

What, for instance, must the thoughtful Chinese reflect when he sees one of America's 'China-towns,' a few blocks of houses, besieged by all sorts of Christian agencies seeking with very indifferent success to convert it? 'Why,' he may well ask, 'do you not send all this energy and devotion to some needy and neglected inland province of China, where you will find little competition?'

Or visiting Britain, he may well marvel at the immense denominational machinery of missions, and ask, 'Why do you not at any rate unite to train the young people you send to China? What do they learn from your great organizations of our culture or of our beliefs before they are sent to change them?' After a hundred years and more of Protestant missions the training given is grotesquely inadequate. It is time to insist on this. The Societies must budget for an adequate training, even if it means cutting down numbers. And, anyhow, to dilute is not to strengthen their forces.

The time is overdue also for the appointment of able Oriental Christians to our Mission Headquarters and to our Theological Faculties.

The Eastern Church should have its say as to whom and what it wants from us, and in helping to train the recruits for this delicate and all-important service.

How great a work for international friendship and understanding such men could do! And how desperately it is needed!

They would be there to remind us that what matters is an Oriental Christianity, not a perpetuation of our differences; or in secular matters that the future of China or of India is more vital than the safeguarding of our commercial interests. And with such action on our part a new spirit would enter into the young Churches of Asia; the spirit of partnership in a great common enterprise.

In political matters—still more in religious matters—what we need are imagination and magnanimity. In a word, Love will succeed where mere justice fails. And to say to the great peoples of China and India: 'Come and tell us how we can help; come and choose your helpers; come and train them to serve your peoples,' is not much more than mere justice demands; it will be accepted as a proof of our love and respect.

The real problem in Asia is that these are lacking. The white man is always in danger of underrating the yellow or brown man. A Chinese is killed by an American sailor—the compensation awarded to his family is £10; a Bavarian is killed by Chinese—the compensation to his country is a province! Police-officers and soldiers who 'shoot to kill' are merely crude exponents of a theory accepted by their betters. When governments refuse to punish them they are at any rate honest. But they are not wise.

Now Buddhism and Christianity alike call us to Brotherhood. Here they can co-operate in a huge but urgent task. To accomplish it will need all their spiritual power. For we all accept the theory and reject the practice.

Recent Foreign Theology.

IN this series of *Studies in the Psalms*, the Norwegian scholar Sigmund Mowinckel reveals one of the freshest and acutest minds at present working on the field of the Old Testament. The fifth volume,¹ which deals with Blessing and Cursing in the Cult and the Psalter, carries us vividly into the primitive

¹ *Psalmstudien: Segen und Fluch in Israels Kult und Psalmdichtung* (Jacob Dybwad, Kristiania).

modes of thought that underlie those religious acts. To blessing and curse alike, and to the rites and words which accompanied them, a certain mysterious power attached—in the case of cursing, a power associated with magic. A prophet's promise of victory or threat of defeat to a king before a battle in a sense actually created the victory or defeat, and the stones which Shimei hurled

at David were themselves charged with the curse.

Mowinckel prepares the way for his discussion of the Psalter by examining very carefully all the other Old Testament references to blessing and cursing in the cult; for example, the priestly blessing in Nu 6²⁴⁻²⁶ and the ordeal prescribed in Nu 5^{11ff.} for the woman accused of adultery. There is a specially valuable discussion of the solemn ceremony described in Dt 27^{11ff.} (cf. 28) which, it is inferred,—no doubt justly,—does not so much describe the acts performed on that occasion as the regular practice at one of the annual religious festivals. Traces of the cultic blessing and curse are to be found in many psalms—blessing, for example, in Ps 118 and 122, while Ps 109 may well preserve an ancient formula of imprecation. In weakened form these contrasts appear in Ps 1 and 112, also not infrequently in the Wisdom literature, while cultic usage has conditioned even prophetic utterances such as Jer 17⁵⁻⁸. Ps 15 and 24³⁻⁶ remind us that in Israel's religion the blessing or the curse is determined by the ethical qualities of the worshipper.

Volume vi.¹ discusses the authorship of the Psalms. It is argued that, while *l'dawid* came to be regarded as indicating Davidic authorship, the real force of the preposition is put beyond doubt by the superscription of Ps 102, 'a prayer *l'ānî*, i.e. *for the use of the afflicted*.' Originally, therefore, the other phrase meant 'a psalm for the use of David,' i.e. such as he used or might have used in a specific situation, and which might therefore be confidently recommended to others similarly situated. This does not of course imply that David composed these psalms; indeed, though some of them might be as early as his time (or even earlier, cf. 19¹⁻⁶), others are evidently much later. Mowinckel argues that David had other things to do than compose poetry, and he regards even the Davidic authorship of the famous elegy over Saul and Jonathan as psychologically improbable. The psalms would be for the most part composed by the Temple singers, who were akin to the Temple prophets, and this accounts for the apparent depreciation of sacrifice characteristic of some of the psalms (e.g. 40, 50, 51, 69). But neither such utterances nor the similar ones of the pre-exilic prophets are to be interpreted as an absolute condemnation of the sacrificial system. The man who could write, 'Let the lifting up of my

hands be as the evening sacrifice,' could dispense with the cult, but he did not despise it. This part of the book is a genuinely helpful discussion of the vexed problem of the relation of the prophets to the sacrificial system.

Theodor Hopfner has contributed to the *Beihefte zum Alten Orient* a little volume² on 'Greek Philosophy and the East,' whose aim is to dispel the delusion cherished by ancient classical writers and revived by certain modern scholars, that the impulse to Greek philosophy came from the East. More particularly with Egypt are the early Greek philosophers associated, but it is ominous that the classical writers who so associate them are all late, hardly, indeed, earlier than the first century B.C., and that the statements grow more positive the further they recede from the events. Hopfner argues that such intercourse between Greek philosophers and Egyptian priests, as these traditions imply, would have been practically impossible in the earlier period, that in any case Greek science and philosophy have no real analogy (except in India) in ancient Oriental speculation, and that it is only in the period beginning with the conquests of Alexander the Great and issuing in Neoplatonism that Oriental influence becomes prominent and profound; but by this time philosophy has become merged in theosophy and mysticism. Hopfner has ably defended his thesis that the great period of Greek philosophy, from the Pre-Socratics to Plato and Aristotle, owes nothing to the East.

To most people Egyptian literature is a sealed book: Professor Adolf Erman, by his delightful volume of excerpts from it,³ has brought its variety and charm within the reach of all. He has written it, he tells us, 'not for the narrow circle of Egyptologists, but for the many who are interested in antiquity, but to whom Egyptian literature has hitherto been inaccessible.' The chapters, which are preceded by a useful chronological table and an introduction which discusses in a highly interesting way the development of the literature, the enormous difficulties that attend the deciphering of it, the forms of its poetry, the minstrels and story-tellers and other literary matters, deal in succession with the pyramid texts, narratives, wisdom, laments,

² *Orient und griechische Philosophie* (Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig; geh. Gm. 2.40).

³ *Die Literatur der Aegypter* (Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig; geh. 7.50, geb. 9 Gm.).

¹ *Psalmstudien: Die Psalmdichter.*

secular poetry, love-songs, etc., from every period, and there is a delightful chapter on schools, which reveals the almost Chinese respect of ancient Egypt for scholarship and which contains the following naïve confession of a pupil to his teacher. 'Thou didst smite upon my back, and thine instruction entered into mine ear.' Most of the extracts are of considerable length and many of them are highly entertaining. Here we have the famous tale of the Two Brothers, whose influence is felt in the story of Joseph; here also is the glorious Hymn to Amon. Apart from the high intrinsic interest of the selections, the book is of real value to the Old Testament student, who is reminded at many points of Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms, Jeremiah, Job, and, above all, of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. In this valuable book exact scholarship is made to serve the edification and the entertainment of the ordinary man.

To all who are interested in ancient civilization,

Dr. Pierre Montet's book¹ will furnish a veritable feast of good things. The decorations of the tombs are drawn upon to illustrate that ancient Egyptian life, which through this book passes before us in all its bewildering variety. Here are illustrations and accounts of hunting, fishing, navigation, agriculture, horticulture, viticulture, music, dance, games, sport, and a score of other activities. Students of Egyptology will welcome the frequent texts and translations scattered throughout the book; while the fine illustrations, the illuminating comment, and the continuous narrative will make an irresistible appeal to all lovers of art and students of human life. The writer wears his learning lightly, and he has written a book which can be read by the unerudite not only with profit but with joy.

¹ *Les Scènes de la Vie privée dans les Tombeaux Égyptiens de l'Ancien Empire.* Milford, 35s. net.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Meditations in the Apocrypha.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR F. TAYLOR, M.A., CANTERBURY.

Ecclesiasticus i. 1, 9, 10, 26.

'All wisdom cometh from the Lord, and is with him for ever. . . . He . . . poured her out upon all his works. . . . She is with all flesh according to his gift. . . . If thou desire wisdom, keep the commandments, and the Lord shall give her unto thee.'

THESE verses give us the sum and substance of this very interesting book in briefest compass. They state the author's four fundamental propositions concerning Wisdom; the four first principles of his thought and life.

All wisdom has its source in God; it is immanent in all creation; it becomes articulate in the Law; and the wisdom of man consists in regulating his life by this articulate wisdom of God.

It is a majestic and poetic conception when we grasp it as a whole. It lifts us first into the height of heaven and gives us a soul-elevating vision of God (cf. vv.⁵⁻⁸); it carries us, as it were in a moment, throughout the whole of creation. God is both transcendent and immanent. It saves us from a vague mysticism and emotionalism by its clear recognition of the value of the spoken and written

word, whereby the wisdom of God assumes for us mortal men definite and helpful form; it safeguards us from a fruitless intellectualism by reminding us that the word of God is not something merely to be known, but to be obeyed. Man's wisdom—man's assimilation of the wisdom of God—is not to be merely philosophic, reflective, theoretic. It is to be ethical and practical also, issuing in a life.

From the eleventh verse onwards this first chapter is a beautiful little essay on 'the fear of the Lord.' Doubtless James, the author of the Epistle, was familiar with it.

Ecclesiasticus ii 2.

'Make not haste in time of trouble.'

It is not easy to endure affliction. It is not easy to stand quiet and patient while calamities sweep over one's soul or desolate one's life. It is but natural for us to hope that our troubles will soon have an end. It is natural for us to try to extricate ourselves from them as speedily as possible. It is difficult not to be impatient.

Some people try to escape troubles by running

away from them, and some by withdrawing themselves from the strain and worry that are all but inseparable from an active, serviceable life. The one is the way of the coward and the other is the way of the recluse.

But it is not much use making haste in time of trouble, for by making haste we do not as a rule extricate ourselves—at least not permanently. Sometimes in rushing out of one trouble we only rush into another, and a worse one. We *are* 'born into trouble as the sparks fly upward.' We have to lay our account by it. How shall we most wisely and bravely face it?

This chapter gives us some counsel on the matter. Let us pass from the second verse to the sixth and we have an answer to our question, which is further amplified in other verses. The best encouragement of our souls, we are told, is a resolute trust in God and a resolute integrity of life: 'Put thy trust in him, and he will help thee. Order thy ways aright, and set thy hope on him.' A man must by no means play the coward: 'Woe unto the faint heart, for it believeth not; therefore shall it not be defended' (v.¹³).

He must not lose patience: 'Woe unto you that have lost your patience; and what will ye do when the Lord shall visit you?' (v.¹⁴). Neither must he seek refuge in divisive courses: 'Woe to the sinner that goeth two ways' (v.¹²). He must remain steadfast in faith, steadfast in integrity, unbroken in patience, inexhaustible in hope.

Ecclesiasticus iii. 1-16.

As the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus was almost certainly professionally engaged in lecturing to young men, and as his book was designed and was probably used as a text-book for this purpose, it is only to be expected that it should have somewhat to say on the relations to one another of parents and children. The first sixteen verses of this chapter form an effective little essay on filial affection; and after having read it the reader will do well to turn to 7^{27, 28}, and the first five verses of chap. 16.

Some of these verses have more than a touch of pathos in them. Can the plea of parents with their children go further than this: 'Give glory to thy father with thy whole heart, and forget not the pangs of thy mother. Remember that of them thou wast born, and what wilt thou recompense them for the things that they have done for thee?' (7^{27, 28}). And there is surely a plaintive appeal in v.¹² of this

chapter: 'My son, help thy father in his old age, and grieve him not so long as he liveth; and if he fail in understanding, have patience with him, and dishonour him not when thou art in thy full strength.'

Quite apart from details, however, one of the most charming features of Jewish religion is the strong domestic sentiment that pervades it. It is essentially a religion of the home life—binding parents to their children, and children to their parents. What is the Book of Deuteronomy from one point of view, but just the world's greatest text-book of family religion, and the very last verse of the Old Testament is not only peculiarly earnest, but peculiarly characteristic. And the quality remains. Any one who has made a study of Jewish prayer-books must have been impressed and affected by the tenderness of their references to parents and children, and must also have noted by the way how this shows up a certain regrettable defect in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. That Prayer Book, based on the old *Horæ* composed by the monks, contains almost no references to family life in its forms for morning or evening worship. If the Prayer Book should indeed be revised, room may perhaps be found some day for an enrichment of it in this respect, even though it should come somewhat near the attempt 'to gild refined gold.'

Ecclesiasticus v. 6.

'Say not his mercy is great; he will be pacified for the multitude of my sins; for mercy and wrath come from him, and his indignation resteth upon sinners.'

Here we have the reproof not of a carnal (as in v.¹), but of a spiritual security. One can easily understand how an evangelical hyper-confidence should emerge as a kind of disease in Christianity, for it is just the exaggeration of a great and comforting truth. Paul himself was annoyed with those who abused or misrepresented his gospel of grace. But from this verse it would appear that gracious views of God were not unknown even in pre-Christian times, and that even then there were men who took otiose views of sin because of their hyper-confidence in the genial loving-kindness of God. Human thought seems to be like the pendulum which is ever seeking the middle position of rest and in the very effort continually swings from one to the other side of it.

But, after all, what are the rights and wrongs of it?

What is the truth concerning God's attitude to the sinner? Sins are punished and some of them very severely, and we must conclude that sin itself is above all very hateful to God, but is there any limit to God's willingness to forgive sin? Not to His willingness, certainly. Our Lord's teaching would seem to be decisive on that point. But ethical considerations must to some extent control that willingness. 'Mercy and wrath come from him, and his indignation resteth upon sinners.' 'Behold the goodness and the severity of God!'

Still our 'hope is in the everlasting' that He will save us. There is no other hope. But the condition is that while we hope in His mercy, we must face up to our faults, and be able to say sincerely that we hate our sin. If God hates sin and we hate sin, we are at heart of one mind with Him, even though we have grievously sinned and are still entangled against our will in the meshes of sin. But if we love sin while He hates it, what ground have we to hope in His mercy?

Ecclesiasticus vii. 36.

'Whatsoever thou takest in thy hand, remember the end, and thou shalt never do amiss.'

Here is a counsel which we should do well to lay to heart. It seems so simple and withal so easy

that before we do anything we should try to realize what will be the result of our doing it, and how we shall feel about it when it is done. But this simple advice is not so easy to follow. It requires the exercise of imagination and the practice of continual recollectedness; and neither of these is easy.

Who has not had the experience of doing something without much anxiety, even with zest, and immediately thereafter being overwhelmed with fear or shame, or remorse. After we have done the deed we wonder how we could ever have contemplated doing it. The other side of the deed shocks and surprises us, and we wonder how we could have been so lacking in imaginative foresight as not to have understood this beforehand. It seemed to Jesus the son of Sirach that if only men could learn to exercise this foresight they would never sin at all. A petty theft, a momentary inadvertence, a slight impulsive word of ill-temper, a sudden act of cowardice or meanness, may give one weeks or months of agonizing fear or shame. Happy are those who through comparatively trivial and not irremediable blunders have learned betimes the truth of this text, and thus, by the grace of God, may hope to safeguard their lives from deeds that bring an immeasurable remorse.

Contributions and Comments.

Buddhism and Christianity.

IN one of the latest numbers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Professor Saunders reviews some of the recent publications dealing with questions which are of vital interest both for the Buddhist and the Christian religions. One of these volumes is the book I published in 1923 under the title *La Théosophie Bouddhique*. He mentions it with a warm understanding for which I feel deeply thankful. But he blames me, in a most courteous manner, for having struck, in my last sentence, a pessimistic note that the rest of the book had not prepared my readers for. He evidently cannot acknowledge with me that Buddhism has been in the end 'a cruel mutilation of human life.' As this is a most important point, I feel sure that the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES and his very distinguished

contributor will allow me to explain my opinion. I shall do it, however, in as few words as possible.

Considering all systems which wish to act upon the moral character of individuals and of human communities—pedagogy, ethics, religion, sociology—we have the right to ask what they are and what they do in regard to life, not an hypothetical and undetermined form of existence, but the life we actually live, on this earth. Do they help to make it richer, more beautiful, better, in one word, more really human?

If we examine Buddhism in the light of this criterion, we have to acknowledge that the ideal it pursues is quite different. Its aim is: to realize the Nirvāṇa; and in whatever way it is considered, Nirvāṇa is, in any case, the negation of life, of phenomenal life, *i.e.* the only life which can be acted upon. And its means: to wage war against

all desire, which it knows to be the real active power of life. Where there is no desire, there can be neither activity nor progress. Desire should not be annihilated; it should be disciplined.

In fact, Buddhism has not proved to be so pernicious for life as it might have been, if it had always acted in accordance with its own principles. Often it has been an admirable school of patience, of courage, of charity, of sacrifice. It became an educator, and soul healing was not foreign to it. In India, China, Japan, we see Buddhism helping widely the material, intellectual, and moral progress of the nations in whose midst it spread. It has also often given proof of a noble understanding of purely human duties. That, however, is to be put to the credit, not of Buddhism, but of the Buddhists, who are not solely beings striving after Nirvāṇa, but are men also.

A little while ago, the minister of a big State, thinking evidently that it would please me to hear it, told me that he was Buddhist at heart. The case is not a rare one any more. They are becoming more and more numerous in our anxious and stormy time, the people who seem to be won over by the teaching of the Great Illuminated. Had I had in mind the interest of my book only, I should not have let my readers remain under an impression of disenchantment. But it seemed to me that it was more necessary to warn them against the seductions of a religion, which is suitable neither for our race nor for our time.

PAUL OLTRAMARE.

Geneva.

We have received also a letter on the same subject from a member of the Wesleyan Mission at Badulla, Ceylon, the author of *The Ethics of Gotama Buddha*, and we quote a few sentences from it:

‘Some Christians go so far as to say that Buddhism and Christianity are, ethically, so nearly alike, that it is an unwarrantable interference for Christian missionaries to attempt to win Buddhists for Christ. In reality, the gulf separating Christianity from Buddhism is wider than that between Christianity and any other of the great religions of mankind. I am referring here, as always in my book, to Primitive Buddhism, and the creed of the Southern Buddhists, which is still identical with it. About that conglomerate of Buddhism, Christianity, and other religions, which is generally called Northern Buddhism, I say nothing. In confirmation of what I have said, I will quote from the

“Findings of the Christian Council Conference at Negombo, Ceylon, September 3-5, 1924.”

“Between fifty and sixty Christian leaders, European, American, Ceylonese, men and women, ministers and laymen, came together, representing all the Churches and Christian Organisations of the Island except the Roman Catholic Church and the Salvation Army. The aim of the Conference was to discover the reasons why there had been so little numerical increase in the Christian Church during the last fifty years, and how a forward movement could be brought about.”

‘Three groups quite independently considered Buddhism in its relation to Christianity during the three days of the Conference, and then the findings were discussed in the full Conference. I quote below a finding of the Conference on Buddhism, which was unanimously accepted:

“This Conference considers that the contrasts between Christianity and Buddhism are not only many, but fundamental; nothing therefore is to be gained by attempting to rise up to Christian concepts from the basis of Buddhist ideas. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is so absolutely different from anything in Buddhism that it should be presented directly and as an entirely new message.”

C. H. S. WARD.

Badulla, Ceylon.

Two Johannine Miracles.

WE are to speak of the narratives found in John 5 and in John 9, noting also their Synoptic sources or parallels. It may be convenient to begin with John 9. Here we find, as nowhere else in the recorded teaching of Jesus, a repudiation of the world-wide moralistic prejudice that exceptional suffering always means exceptional sin. It is common to quote the early verses of Luke 13 as conveying the same lesson; but the denial, in that passage, of exceptional guilt in those who had so tragically suffered is lost in the greater emphasis laid upon the guilt of the whole generation—that generation to which after the flesh Christ belonged, which refused to repent even at His summons. The atmosphere of eschatology and the message of judgment cannot be explained away. They belong to the best verified elements in the teaching of the Master.

Several Synoptic echoes must strike every reader of John 9; but much the most significant of such parallels from the earlier Gospels seems to be found in the story and in the very name of Bartimæus. It has sometimes been objected that such a name—‘son of uncleanness’—is incredible. Does not John 9 give us our clue? The view which is implied in the disciples’ question (v.²) is blatantly urged by the out-argued Pharisees (v.³⁴) and is denied only by Christ—the view that there must be essential uncleanness and guiltiness in any one marked out by peculiar misfortune. Bartimæus in the Synoptics belongs to Jericho; the hero of John 9 is more naturally assigned to Jerusalem, though perhaps not inevitably. Yet both narratives record the memorable cure of a blind man very near the end of Jesus’ earthly career; it has even been suggested that, according to the Synoptics, healings had for some time been rare events and that this great wonder revived enthusiasm among the people. There is nothing in the Synoptic record corresponding to the after history of the Johannine friend of Jesus, whose lively and engaging polemic against the by no means vapid objections of Jewish spite, contrasts favourably with many passages of the Fourth Gospel, where the wisdom of the Master is arrayed against blank stupidity. The correspondence of the difficult name Bartimæus with the theological background of John 9 may fairly be described—in words too often used without warrant—as an ‘undesigned coincidence.’ A further question arises. Does this coincidence strengthen the case for what is most preternatural in the Johannine record? Does the nickname¹ preserved for us by Mark carry with it the implication of *congenital* blindness?

John 5 supplies a complementary and counterbalancing message. While it is false that all suffering implies peculiar personal guilt, yet sometimes suffering has sprung directly from fault, folly, or sin. The victim may have come to forget this. He may now be, to his own habitual consciousness, pitifully unfortunate. Yet in reality he has been guilty, and his conscience may be aroused to bear testimony against him. Here, again, we are reminded of ‘Triple Tradition’—of the Capernaum paralytic whose ‘sins were forgiven him’ before the words of healing were spoken, and who in due course carried off his pallet before the astonished crowd. A. B. Bruce’s suggestion—that Jesus in Capernaum

¹ One assumes that ‘son of Timæus’ though of course a possible translation, can hardly be correct.

spoke *ad hominem*—is surely strangely perverse. If it were a mere superstition that sin had brought suffering upon this helpless man, how could the Light of the World—He who felt as no other human heart could do, the tremendous essential bitterness of sin—confirm such error in the man himself and in all who were listening?

If the Johannine and Synoptic narratives in this instance are more than parallels—if they are variant records of the same event—it would seem that the Fourth Gospel, which leaves so many of its few recorded wonders to Galilee, has transferred this one to Jerusalem.

Also, while in this case—indeed, in both the cases before us—John assigns the miracle to the Sabbath day, and makes Jewish jealousy for the Sabbath one ground for hostility to Jesus, this feature is common in other Synoptic records, but not in those most closely parallel miracle narratives to which we have been referring. Of greater significance perhaps is the circumstance that, in its own way, John 5 includes the major charge of blasphemy and of infringing Divine prerogatives (vv.^{17, 18}). The same accusation stands in the Synoptic story of the healed paralytic—Jesus blasphemed when He forgave sin! It is not uncharacteristic of the Johannine mind that that high prerogative and that special form of offence do not appear anywhere in the Fourth Gospel. The forgiveness of sins is not among the keynotes of the beautiful baffling book.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Manchester.

‘Sowing with Tears.’

THE reference to tears in Ps 126⁵⁻⁶ is at first sight difficult. W. E. Addis, in Peake’s *Commentary on the Bible* (p. 393, col. 2), speaks of ‘the contrast between painful ploughing and the joy of the harvest home.’ But the text does not suggest that ploughing is painful. Why should it? Ploughing may be laborious, but it is a labour of love. There is as much joy in ploughing as there is in reaping. Certainly there is much joy in sowing. R.V. translates ‘they that sow in tears shall reap in joy.’ Why should people sow in tears? If they do sow in tears, is it not likely that they will do their work badly and reap in tears rather than in joy? I submit that the translation ‘in tears’ is a misunderstanding. The word *bē-dim’ah* should be

translated 'with tears.' Cheyne, in his translation of the Book of Psalms in 'The Dryden Library' (1905), so translates the word, but he does not realize that there is any difference in the meaning. There is. The passage preserves a hint of the primitive belief, referred to in my *Givers of Life* (1923, pp. 54 f., 60 f.), that tears are creative, life-giving, fertility-producing. The whole passage should be translated: 'Those who sow with tears shall reap with shouts of joy. One goes along weeping, carrying the seed-measure; one comes home with shouts of joy, carrying his sheaves.' The last two clauses look like an explanatory gloss on the first clause, which again looks like a proverbial saying. In any case, the meaning seems to be this: Israel has shed bitter tears, but in the end these will prove to be like the sweet life-giving tears which have been credited with the power of fertilizing the soil and producing a rich harvest.

I ought to add that, since the above was written, I find that Mr. Donald A. Mackenzie in his book, *Myths of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 82 f., quotes Ps 126, and connects it with agricultural weeping ceremonies. His explanation, however, is different from mine. He writes: 'Corn deities were weeping deities; they shed fertilizing tears; and the sowers simulated the sorrow of divine mourners when they cast seed in the soil "to die," so that it might spring up as corn. This ancient custom, like many others, contributed to the poetic imagery of the Bible.' It is a mistake, I hold, to suppose that in magical and religious rites and ceremonies the shedding of tears always signifies pain or sorrow.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

The University, Manchester.

The Place of an Adjective.

'Good Master, what shall I do?'—Mk 10¹⁷, Lk 18³⁶.

'Master, what good thing shall I do?'—Mt 19¹⁶.

In Matthew the divergence is striking. The A.V. retains the form of address—'Good Master,' but in the R.V. 'good' is omitted. Presumably, it did not appear in the original MS. of Matthew's Gospel, but was introduced into the *Textus Receptus*, which is a revision rather than a copy of the original text, and by no means free from inaccuracies. The compilers of this edition would have noted that both Mark and Luke had the form 'Good Master,' and they would conclude that Matthew had made

a mistake in shifting the position of the adjective. Swete suggests that the change may have been due to the shifting of the adjective in the original—רַבִּי לֵה הַטּוֹב became רַבִּי לֵה הַטּוֹב. At all events, the assumption that Matthew made a slip seems to rob him of what we believe to be a deliberate purpose on his part, and takes away from his original contribution to this portion of the gospel history. It has come to be recognized that the Gospels are individual impressions of Jesus, statements by different men, who had a common source of information to draw upon. So each told the story in his own way.

It seems fairly certain, then, that Matthew omitted the word 'good' at the beginning with deliberate purpose, and simply wrote 'Master'; and also that he deliberately inserted the word 'good' where the others omitted it. All three were agreed that the adjective came in somewhere; but Matthew alone felt that there was something wrong with a record which made Jesus call His own Divinity in question. And, in that feeling, most intelligent readers of the Gospels have shared—have felt that there is something incongruous in the question ascribed to Jesus—τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; Why should He have objected to ἀγαθόν being used of Himself? A recent number of *Punch* gave a caricature of our colloquial use of the term—a superior lady accosting a perfect stranger with—'My good man,' . . . to which came the disconcerting reply: 'Pardon me, madam, I am not a good man.' Yet, thus do we often address one another—'My good sir,' 'My good fellow'—and how we should be taken aback if the answer were made—'What do you mean by calling me good?' I imagine we would reply that we didn't mean anything by it; that it was only a form of speech. So, even if the adjective had been used in this colloquial sense of Jesus, is it likely that He would have objected to it on the ground that there was nothing in it? It is still less likely that He would have said in so many words: 'I am not a good man; there is none good but God.' Would Jesus have thus distinguished between Himself and God? He who said, 'I and my Father are one.' To Mark and Luke it may have seemed derogatory to Jesus to omit the adjective; to Matthew it called in question His perfect goodness to insert it. The Divinity of Jesus speaks for itself.

That explains the divergence not only in the question but in the answer. Not τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;

but τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; 'Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? There is One who is good, even God.' That is to say: 'Is it necessary to ask Me or any one else, what good thing you ought to do in order to inherit eternal life? It is not a proper question. No one good thing, no number of good things will give you eternal life—nothing but the Absolute Good, God Himself. The source of all goodness is in God. Even My goodness is the goodness of God manifesting itself in Me. 'The Son can do nothing of Himself but what He seeth the Father doing.' 'For, as the Father hath life in Himself, even so He gave to the Son also to have life in Himself.' . . . 'I can do nothing of myself . . . but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works.'

Thus did Jesus bear witness to the goodness of God. His own goodness spoke for itself. This young man was convinced of it, when he saw Him receive and bless the little children. He realized, in a moment, that Jesus had the Divine secret. And he was too greatly moved to address Him in a manner that was either merely conventional or fulsomely complimentary. It is not on compli-

mentary titles that the Divinity of Jesus depends. His goodness speaks for itself. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven.'

It is a much needed lesson in the manner we should address our Lord, not simply an interesting point in literary criticism. If we are His true disciples and He is our Master, we can dispense with the complimentary title. It only serves to throw doubt on His goodness. Let us reserve the adjective for our conduct; let us so act that the things we do shall merit the name of good. It will suffice, so far as Jesus is concerned, if we simply call Him Master, and mean what we say. He could not be but a 'good' Master. It is for us to be His good disciples. 'He that hath my sayings, and doeth them, he it is that loveth me.'

O Master, Master,
These sayings of Thine,
Help me to make them
Doings of mine.

E. MACMILLAN.

Pretoria.

Entre Nous.

Epaphroditus, God's Gambler.

We have pleasure in publishing a letter on the above which we have just received from the Archbishop of Melbourne:

'SIR,—In "Entre Nous," in your May number, you call attention to a fine passage in "As at the First" by my friend Dr. J. A. Hutton. He speaks of Epaphroditus who "laid down his life as a stake," "cast his life like a die." May I call your attention to a further fact, which has not, I think, been noticed by commentators hitherto? Was there any reason why St. Paul's thinking should have been along lines of the gambler's throw? I think there was: for Aphrodite and Venus were the goddesses of gamblers. The Roman soldier who made the highest cast cried "Venus," and called it "Venereus," as Horace and Propertius among the poets, and Suetonius and Cicero among prose writers, have told us. Now the Greeks did the same, and their equivalent was the word ἐπαφρόδιτος. Appian uses it in this sense, and so does Plutarch

in his life of Sulla (see Liddell and Scott, *s.v.*). "Blessed with gambler's luck in the throw of the dice because the divine hand was behind it." That is the meaning of Epaphroditus, and so St. Paul writes with a smile, as he did when he played on the name of Onesimus in his letter to Philemon. He says Epaphroditus gambled with his life, but won, because God was there and "had mercy on him." It is like Wiclif's old rendering of Joseph's career, "The Lord was with him, and he was a luckie felawe." The coincidence of thought between St. Paul's metaphor, and the meaning of the name of the man about whom he used it, are surely too striking to be accidental, and I imagine that in addition, this view fixes the reading in favour of the three great uncials as against C.

'May I add, Sir, what a continual delight THE EXPOSITORY TIMES is to a busy Bishop at the Antipodes in the midst of distractions that invade study all too seriously?'—I am, Sir, Yours faithfully,

HARRINGTON C. LEES.

POINT AND ILLUSTRATION.

'The heavens declare the glory of God.'

The Reader in Talmudic at the University of Cambridge, Mr. I. Abrahams, has published three lectures which he delivered at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York. They will repay careful reading, and they will require it, for they are packed with matter albeit the style is pleasantly discursive. The subject of the lectures is *The Glory of God* (Milford; 3s. 6d. net).

I recall how, during a determined aeroplane raid on London, hostile bombs and defensive anti-aircraft guns were noisily disturbing the night—when suddenly the skies opened to the natural lightnings, and the thunders pealed out their tremendous notes of glory. How puny seemed man's fiercest efforts in presence of this artillery of heaven. Guns and bombs were silenced: a solemn hush ensued as the Lord waked up out of His holy habitation, coming with cloud and thunder to rebuke His quarrelsome children. I speak, saith the Lord; do ye hold your peace! And as we all stood at reverent attention, with a certain expectancy before this revelation of majestic power, more than one of us must have laughed at the shallowness of Pope's facile *Essay on Man*, with its attribution of such emotions exclusively to savages:

Lo, the poor Indian, whose untutored mind
Sees God in clouds, or hears Him in the wind,

'Our minds, we fondly conceive, are more tutored, and so were the minds of the authors of the Mishnah (Berakoth ix. 2). And these bid us, and we obey, at the sight of such natural phenomena to think of the Creator of them, to bless Him whose power and might fill the world. If, unlike primitive races, we fear the storm less, it is not because we are less awe-struck, but because we estimate higher our chances of immunity. We know more of the science of electricity.'

The quotation given above is from the first lecture on 'The Glory of God in Nature.' Mr. Abrahams passes from that, and from the second lecture on the fruition of the experience in the Messianic Age to what interests him most—the conception of the glory of God manifested in its pragmatic application to life.

'It is left to us to vindicate God's love for His world, and His hope in us. We must be ever

ready. There is no other time but here and now. This is the pragmatic climax. Joshua b. Qorha points out (Exod. R., ch. xlv. end), that at the burning bush, when God appeared to Moses in the fire, he was at first curious, but when God proclaimed Himself, Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God. Later on, when he yearned to see the glory, he was told, "No man shall see Me and live." "When I sought, thou soughtest not; now that thou seekest, I seek not." Man must not waste his opportunities. He must ever be ready to receive the vision, in a sense to deserve it by surrendering himself—when the vision is offered—"for Thy sake, O Lord, and not for ours." Honour God with thy very substance. There must be no reluctance of expenditure, no limitation of preparedness to give:

Give all thou canst: high heaven rejects the lore
Of nicely calculated less or more.

And the glory of God exudes happiness. "What else can I do?" asks Epictetus. An oft-cited saying, but I cite it again. What else can I do, a lame old man, than sing hymns to God? *Ich kann nicht anders*—how this cry of determination echoes down the ages, it is the cry of the poet, the cry also of the martyrs. Here the glory of God transfigures death. But it also dignifies life. Honesty, generosity, justice, amiability, chastity—all these human qualities are given a richer flavour, make a stronger appeal, when they are seen as acts of glorification. "Thy glory is beautiful, I will beautify it!" is Eleazar b. Hyrkanos' comment on Canticles iii. 14.

The Seen and Temporal.

Whether it be a sign of grace or no, there is a page in the *Methodist Recorder* that we turn to first every week. It is the page contributed by 'Ezra.' We quote below a story that he told last week of his own little girl—for he is never happier than when, like Lady Glenconner he is giving us the Sayings of the Children:

'It was my little girl's bedtime. She had been bathed and clad in the little pyjama-suit, of which she is prouder than of any of her possessions, because it is just like Daddy's, and allowed to play a little while with her Teddy before being carried aloft. But there were her prayers to be said first, and kneeling on her Mother's knee she

repeated, not without a few promptings, the words we have all learned and so often said. My eyes were very tender as I looked on, for what is there more lovely than the spectacle of innocence at prayer? A picture of demure piety she was, until her little prayer was ended, and then, even as she said "Amen," she leaped to her feet upon her mother's knee, and with eyes that danced, exclaimed, "And now, let's say, 'Sing a song of sixpence,' Mummy. I like it better." I turned away with a smile and a sigh; the sigh being produced by my recognition of my own faultiness in the conduct of my bairn, for I too, only too often, turn away from prayer to mundane things with very similar zest.'

Fear.

'The exponents of certain forms of "new thought," what William James designated "the religion of healthy-mindedness," regard fear as one of the chief, or even the chief, of the opponents of human welfare. But Jesus did not tell men to get rid of fear, so much as to transfer their fear from a less to a more dangerous object. "I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into Gehenna; yea, I say unto you, Fear him" (Lk 12^{4, 5}). Does our Lord bid us fear God or Satan? The former view has had the weightier backing; but the latter has recently been revived by Miss Dougall and Mr. Emmet. "Perfect love" for God "casteth out fear" for God (1 Jn 4¹⁸); but fear in the form of caution may be needed in a world where evil has still existence and power.'¹

Have Salt in Yourselves.

'It is not easy to be sure of exactly what was in our Lord's mind when He used this metaphor, nor can we assert that He always meant quite the same. But we know what the word "salt" suggests to us, something that counteracts insipidity and also preserves from corruption. The Christian life, He seems to say, is not all mildness and softness and relaxation. There must be something in it comparable to the stinging saltiness of the sea-breeze and the cold sea-water, smarting, stimulating, giving tone to the system. Swinburne

writes of the sea, "thy large embraces are keen like pain." James Hinton in his little book, *The Mystery of Pain*, contends that the intensest joys have an element of pain in them, and that life would be poorer, were it not for self-sacrifice, which implies pain. The sacrificial quality of the Christian ethics, that in the personality which delights in hardship and accepts pain, which holds on determinedly through opposition and disaster, which inspires a meek readiness to suffer and die for God's purposes, is the salt of human life. "Every one has to be consecrated by the fire of the discipline." Yes; for nothing mawkish or morbid can exist in God's Kingdom.'²

Service.

Everyone knows what Toc H. stands for. 'Toc is the army signaller's way of saying T. T. H. means Talbot House at Poperinghe which was opened nine years ago. Toc H. also stands for the motto of the movement, "To conquer Hate." It is a society in which all are equal, and its members are young fellows over sixteen from all grades of life.

'Every branch has a lamp of maintenance, generally presented by some one in memory of his friends. One of these was presented by the Prince of Wales. The members gather round the lamp every week or fortnight to remember those who fell in the War, and to pledge themselves to carry on their work. And this is the ritual when a new member is admitted:

"John Smith, what lit this lamp?"

"Unselfish Sacrifice."

"What alone can maintain it?"

"Unselfish Service."

"What is Service?"

"The rent we pay for our room on earth."³

² *Ibid.* 163.

³ This is from *The Gate of Pearl* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net) by the Rev. G. C. Leader, B.D. It is a volume of addresses to boys and girls. Mr. Leader has a fine way with the young, and this is the best book he has given us.

¹ F. A. M. Spencer, *The Ethics of the Gospel*, 158.